THE

THEOLOGICAL ECLECTIC.

A SERIES OF THEOLOGICAL PAPERS CHIEFLY SELECTED FROM THE PERIODICAL AND OTHER LITERATURE OF GREAT BRITAIN, FRANCE, GERMANY, AND HOLLAND.

EDITED BY

GEORGE E. DAY,

PROFESSOR IN LANE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

VOL. II.

CINCINNATI.

WILLIAM SCOTT,

28 *WEST FOURTH STREET,*

1865.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/theological-eclectic_1865_2

CONTENTS OF VOL. II.

ART. PAGE

I.—Considerations on the Pentateuch. . . . 1–46
By Isaac Taylor.

II.—Moses and Colenso. 47–71
By Dr. E. W. Hengstenberg.—Evangelische Kirchen-Zeitung.

III.—How to Preach the Gospel with Variety and Freshness. 72–80
Glasgow Evangelical Repository.

IV.—Biblical Botany. 81–115
British and Foreign Evangelical Review.

V.—Rev. Charles Simeon and the Secret of his Success. 115–120
Christian Observer.

VI.—The Imprecatory Psalms. 121–142
British and Foreign Evangelical Review.

VII.—The Authorized Version of the Epistle of Paul to the Romans, Revised. . . . 143–164
By Five Clergymen of the Church of England.

VIII.—The Doctrines of Christianity the True Solution of the Problems of Natural Religion. 165–193
By M. Guizot.—Revue Chrétienne.

IX.—The Subject of the Twenty-Second Psalm. 193–194
By Dr. Franz Delitzsch.

X.—Present Tendency of Religious Thought in Great Britain and Ireland. 195–223
By Rev. James M'Cosh, D. D.

ART. PAGE

XI.—Christ and the Doctors; or, Faith *vs.* Philosophy. 224–234
By Peter Bayne.

XII.—How to use the Gospels. 235–245
By Henry Alford, D. D.—Sunday Magazine.

XIII.—The Christian Church and Social Improvement. 246–266
British and Foreign Evangelical Review.

XIV.—Newport-Pagnel and its Associations. . . 267–276
United Presbyterian Magazine.

XV.—Popular Infidelity in the Metropolis. . . 277–286
Journal of Sacred Literature.

THE

THEOLOGICAL ECLECTIC.

CONSIDERATIONS ON THE PENTATEUCH.*

BY ISAAC TAYLOR.

ONE of the Laity is warranted in coming forward on the present occasion, inasmuch as the author of a book which attracts much attention again and again invites the non-clerical members of the Church of England to give him a hearing. But if we of the unlearned laity are to listen, it is implied that we may use our plain understandings in listening; and, moreover, that if we are not convinced by a Bishop's reasoning, we may express our dissatisfaction aloud. Dr. Colenso says, that "to the strong, practical love of truth, which is the characteristic of his fellow-countrymen, whether Clergy or Laity, he appeals in this instance."

An appeal, thus worded, fairly relieves those to whom it is addressed from the necessity of showing that they, individually, are qualified by much learning, or by ample professional acquirements, for taking a part in the argument. The ground is not (so we take it) a *preserve*, to intrude upon which should be accounted an offense.

Yet the condition above mentioned—namely, "a strong, practical love of truth," may need, perhaps, a further qualification in any one of the Laity who, after he has given due attention to so high an argument, backed as it is with Hebrew, presumes to declare his discontent and disallowance of the same, through the Press. This further qualification should include so much acquaintedness with the subject in debate as is likely to be possessed by

---

*In reply to Bishop Colenso. Third Edition. London: 1863.

a layman who, through the course of many years, has been conversant with theological books, and to whose thoughts whatever belongs to the subject now brought forward has always been familiar. This, then, is my own ground; and this is the measure of the pretension I make in thus stepping forth to declare my utter disapproval of the volume on "the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua."

Taking position among the Laity of the Church of England, and humbly asking leave, also, to be admitted within the inclosure designated by Bishop Colenso as that of the "*intelligent* Laity," I must insist upon my own interpretation of what follows, when it is affirmed "that a very wide-spread distrust does exist among *these* as to the soundness of the ordinary view of Scripture Inspiration." This may be a fact; and, inasmuch as on several occasions, in the course of forty years, I have given expression, in terms more or less explicit, to my own feeling on this subject, and have done so very lately, I would not appear to retract that profession. I have always thought that a better understanding of what we mean when we speak of the "inspiration" of the Scriptures is much to be desired. But then the question comes—*In what direction* would this better understanding lead us? Would it lead us toward MORE BELIEF, or toward *less belief?* I confidently think that, whereas the doctrine of Inspiration which the modern Church has inherited from the ancient, and from the mediæval Church, was an inference from a *deductive* theology, and was, therefore, *speculative* and *precarious*, better notions on the subject, which will be the result of an *inductive* theology, will, therefore, be more serviceable in consolidating our faith in the Scriptures, regarded as a direct revelation from God.

A consequence the very contrary of this must ensue from our accepting the conclusions which Bishop Colenso labors, in his book, to establish. It will appear that these conclusions—if, indeed, we are to follow them out to their proper issue—will leave not a remnant of our faith in the Bible as an authoritative source of belief in matters of religion. The last pages of the volume are occupied with passages cited from the (also inspired) Bible of the Sikh Gooroos. All Bibles, we are told, are alike good, so far as every man finds or thinks them to be good; and yet this grave disparagement rests upon the Hebrew, and, perhaps, also upon the Christian Scriptures, namely, that the eternal truths they incident-

ally teach are commingled, in a manner peculiarly intimate, with the conceits and the inventions of the writers, and with the superstitions of remote ages; and, worse still, with a body of pretended history, which—some fragments excepted—is spurious and fabulous.

Among those, therefore, who profess to be dissatisfied with our inherited notions of Inspiration, there may be a difference of opinion as wide as could at all be put into words. For instance—a Christian Bishop is now content thus to express his own belief concerning those signal passages, occurring in the third and the sixth chapters of Exodus, which hitherto religious men in all ages have read with awe. "It matters not," he says, "that the writer (whether it be Moses or some other) may have exhibited the living truth in the clothing of human imagery, and embodied the divine lesson which his own mind had received, and which he felt himself commissioned to impart to his fellow man, in the story of the flaming bush and the audible voice." "It matters not," he thinks, "to the reflective and truth-loving men of this reflective age, whether they are to receive 'living truths' in the purity of philosophic expression, or, as we find them in the Hebrew Scriptures, commingled with gross falsities and imbedded in spurious narrations!"

Here then I am irreconcilably at issue with my episcopal instructor. That "practical love of truth," to which he makes his appeal, and that broad and robust common sense of which I make profession as one of the unlearned Laity, impel me to resist—and I might even say, to *resent*—any such pernicious suggestion as this. "It does not matter," the Bishop says. Nay, truly, it *does* matter to me, whether henceforth I am to drink in religious truth for the nourishment of the soul—pure as from the well of life, or am to swallow it—repugnant—laden, as now I am told it is, with a copious feculence of human conceits! "It does not matter," the Bishop says! Yes, indeed, it *does* matter. I may say that, although a layman, I have had experience of the ill effect of being long conversant with the infectious admixture of truth and falsity, of Christian verities, and of ecclesiastical inventions. I know what it is to spend hours, days, months, in the wearisome employment of making acquaintance with what is unreal and spurious, until one comes almost to be in doubt about every thing, and to be in danger of indignantly rejecting truth and falsity in mass, as if to disentangle the two were an im-

practicable task. I have spent time enough with the fourth and the fifth century writers—with Palladius, and with Gregory of Tours, and with Gregory the Great, and with others, until I have been tempted to despair of human nature altogether, and of the destiny of man, as related to God, and as the inheritor of immortality. Does it not matter? Indeed to me it does matter, for I am not only one of the unlearned Laity, to whose love of truth this Bishop makes his appeal so confidently, I am father of a family, and, in years past, have been used to officiate as priest in my own household. But now, if those years were still in passing, and, at this very time, I were to become a convert to the doctrine of this book on the Pentateuch, what could be my text to-morrow in teaching my family the first truths in theology? Should I thus address "the Church in the house," and say, "Moses, or some other Jew, makes, in this chapter, a noble profession of his faith in God; for it appears that he was a monotheist; but as to the "*story of the bush*" in the midst of which this faith is imbedded, it must be regarded as wholly fabulous! I should not do this; but instead of thus talking, I should take a course which, no doubt, those of the Laity will soon take who may yield themselves to the teaching of this book "on the Pentateuch;" they will manfully renounce the profession they hitherto have made as Christians. Give us, they will reasonably say, give us, if it be only the feeblest glimmer of truth, conveyed in the vague dialect of speculative philosophy; but do not thrust upon us these same precious particles, needing to be washed from out of the alluvium of the ignorance, the imposture, and the folly of remote ages.

It does not appear, or it does not appear from his book on the Pentateuch, that Dr. Colenso has himself any consciousness of that vehement feeling which, in unsophisticated minds, impels them to part off—right hand and left hand—to the utmost remoteness, religious truth, and religious lying—or lying of any sort. He does not, I think, know the mood of the unlearned Laity to whom he makes this unadvised appeal. I must not, and *will* not, here be understood. If I know something of English lay feeling, I have come to know *also* something of those intellectual confusions—those inexplicable meditative fascinations—which have led some of the most refined, the most acute, the most moral, the most delicately sensitive minds to converse with

their own illusions, until, in fact, they have quite lost the power of discrimination. Seraph and Demon show faces much alike in the twilight of their chambers. The case of the devout Romanist, born and bred in the Church of miracles, and who reads alternately the Gospels and the "Lives of the Saints," with a child-like homogeneous confidence, desiring only to be edified, is easy to be understood, and it is a case that might be envied by those with whom reason has been fully quickened, and who are making the fatal discovery which Dr. Colenso is now making. At this present moment he believes that he shall be able to keep his hold of a Bible—full of fables. The time is near when he will know this to be impossible. At latest he will find it so when he returns to his duties among his Zulus.

The Bishop, and with him the learned and estimable Hebraist on whom he leans, both of them greatly misunderstand the Laity. I crave leave to say—and hope I may say it without the imputation of any illiberal feeling toward the ministers of religion—that clergymen often do so. They may hear or read the rude scoffs of irreligious men; but they do not know the inner mind of those who, Sunday after Sunday, occupy pews, and who respectfully hear sermons. Laymen of this order are restrained, by many motives that are not blameworthy, from uttering their thoughts freely and at large in the presence of their spiritual instructors. And then, on their side, the clergy may be restrained, by proper reasons of discretion, from using an absolute ingenuousness in relation to religious questions; they know that they may be captiously misunderstood and misreported. Reserve, if not silence, is their safety, as members of a profession.

In the present instance Dr. Colenso misunderstands the Laity, because, in his own mind, as is quite manifest throughout his book, he has confounded what belongs to three momentous subjects, the keeping which apart is always, and is just now especially, important. These three subjects—distinct as they are—may thus be parted off. The first to be named is the perplexing and painful question of Clerical subscription: the second is the doctrine or belief we hold concerning the Inspiration of the canonical Scriptures: the third, and incomparably the most momentous of the three, concerns the truth of the Bible, as the authentic record of a supernatural revelation—in a word, *its truth as history.*

In relation to these three matters no reader of this book "on the Pentateuch" can doubt that the author, unconsciously to himself, borrows his supposition of lay opinion in relation to one or two of them, and applies it to another of them, in a manner which, if he knew better, he would see to be unwarrantable. There may be, and I think there are, very many of the Laity of the Church of England who, if only the way were fairly open for their doing so, would warmly approve of, and would give their aid to, any movement that should issue in a relaxation, or rather an improved form of the terms of Clerical subscription. Those of the Laity who so think and feel are not, therefore, to be spoken of as if they held an ambiguous orthodoxy, or as if they were wishing for doctrinal laxity of any sort. This, however, is a subject foreign to my purpose, and I allude to it only that I may contradict the supposition that those of the Laity who wish for, and who would gladly promote, an alteration of the terms of subscription, do stand, or that they might be brought to stand, on the side of the Bishop of Natal in the weighty questions that are argued in his book.

There may be laymen—a thoughtful few—the intelligent readers of theological and biblical works, who *are* "distrustful" of the notions commonly expressed in such books concerning the Inspiration of the Scriptures. Some of these thoughtful men may incline this way—some incline that way; and some may hold themselves in suspense, believing that the discussion which this subject is now undergoing will issue in the general, if not the universal, adoption of the better-defined belief than hitherto has been admitted or sanctioned. Dr. Colenso deceives himself if he imagines that the educated Laity *at large* are likely to accept any such notions of Inspiration as they find put forth in his book on the Pentateuch. None will do so but those—whether they may be few or many, who, after a little while, will walk out of Church, never to return; and who will rightly say—it is a Christian Bishop that has been our leader in this Exodus.

It is with the third only of the three matters above named that I concern myself in these pages: I mean it is only with what bears upon the truth of the Bible history, *as history*. Of the terms of Clerical subscription I say nothing. Of the Inspiration of the Scriptures I *here* say nothing; what I have to say, and to say in behalf of the unlearned, but not unintelligent, Laity of

the Church of England, relates to the certainty—the *reality* of "those things which are most surely believed among us;" and of these things I propose to speak (very briefly) in the style and temper which I think is characteristic of the non-professional, or call it the *lay mind*, as distinguished from the professional, or the *regulated* and authentically instructed mind to whose decisions such matters are customarily submitted. There *is* good ground for the distinction here made, which it is important to note: it is a distinction that is peculiarly *English;* it springs from that mood of independence, and of self-reliance, and of courage, and of power, tempered by modesty, and by a due regard to constituted authorities, which so favorably marks the British people, entitling them to stand foremost among the nations of Europe. What is trial by jury?—say, it is the security of the individual accused, in putting his life and welfare into the hands of his equals: but it is more than this: and especially it is so in civil suits, for it is then an appeal from the fully-instructed interpreters of law, to the broad and healthful common sense of the uninstructed Laity—laymen as to law. So be it ever—and especially so may it be within the precincts of theology. It is in approval of this same principle of a *final* appeal to a non-professional tribunal that the Church of England acknowledges the royal supremacy, and knows of no higher court than that of the sovereign, king or queen, who seeks the advice of those who, although they may be accomplished lawyers, are, in respect to religious questions, laymen. On any occasion when the vigorous common sense and the practical intelligence of laymen is called in to adjudge matters which have become entangled and mystified in the hands of the profession, this appeal is made—not on the supposition that an advantage can accrue in any case from the overriding of knowledge by ignorance, which can never happen; but on this better and true hypothesis—namely, that a great principle of analogy prevails upon the wide field of human affairs, so that the tacit and unwritten logic of common reason which has been trained on that field, and which, in the arduous occasions of ordinary life and of business, has acquired sagacity, and has sharpened its discriminative instincts, may, with excellent effect, be brought to bear upon problems that have been smothered under technical refinements, and that are disguised by erudite sophistry.

Nevertheless, on such occasions, the lay mind knows its boundary, and pays respectful attention to the professional mind, whenever it ought so to do. Thus it is, often, that eminent physiologists or chemists are listened to when called into the witness-box. We laymen in the jury-box listen to knowledge; and yet it is with a cautious reserve that we listen to it; and for maintaining ourselves in this reserve we are wont to call in professional knowledge to revise, or to contradict, professional knowledge; and then we weigh the one learned testimony against the other learned testimony, leaving learned reputations on either side to fare as they may.

And thus, in Theology, or in a high Christian argument, we part off those matters in relation to which an authorized acquaintance with the subject is indispensable, from those to which rightfully the good, native, common sense of educated men—men accustomed to deal with various secular concernments—is undoubtedly competent. Dr. Colenso makes his appeal to a tribunal of this sort: will he now abide by the decision which, I think, will in due time be pronounced by it—by the public—upon the merits of the book on the "Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua?" I do not think he will relish this award.

The table of contents of the volume in question may be regarded as a setting forth of the Articles of Impeachment—not of Moses, for Moses appears to escape the range of the prosecution; but of the unknown Jew, or Jews, the men of a late age, who have fabricated a history of the early times of their people. Now, in looking to these counts of indictment (say they are nineteen) for the purpose of distributing them among the counsel for the defense, eight or nine of these heads of accusation are of that sort which would make it proper to hand them over to the most erudite of the pleaders. The points in question are, as we may say, *points of law*, proper to be reserved for learned consideration: it is, at least, *seemly* so to reserve them. As to the ten or eleven of these grounds of exception, on the validity of which the plaintiff mainly rests his plea, they are of a kind which comes thoroughly within the reach of non-professional intelligence. On *these* matters the jury may be left to form their opinion, and to come to a verdict without returning into court to ask for guidance. It is then in relation to these intelligible matters that I am bold to plead on the side of the defense.

But now a jury might wish to know whatever may fairly be known concerning the motives and the personal qualities of the plaintiff. They may at least listen to what, of his own accord, he says of himself. I need not occupy these pages with citations from a "Preface" which everybody will have read. Briefly stated, the case is this: and we might have believed it easily of a clergyman ordained in the last ember weeks, but should not have imagined any thing of the sort as likely to have happened in the experience of a Bishop of the English Church, and to one who has stood before the world advantaged by a great reputation.

The Bishop of Natal declares that, until quite lately, he had been uninformed concerning certain grave questions bearing upon the early history of the Hebrew people! He had known, indeed, that there were difficulties ahead in the biblical criticism of the Pentateuch: but he had barely known what they were, and, like the school-boy with his Euclid in hand, who has heard of the difficult theorem, he goes on in faith that, when he comes up to it, he shall be told how to resolve the perplexity. But it was in converse with an intelligent Zulu convert that a sharp point of one of these difficulties stops his way: he is staggered: he sends home to his publisher for books, German mostly; and now he is more and more bewildered. Yet it is for a moment only; and, with little delay, he sets himself clear of the restraints of "superstition." He quits his charge in the wilderness, hastens home, writes and publishes a book in hot haste! Not doubting the soundness of his conclusions, he proclaims it to the Christian world, that, on the ground, not of "speculation," or of *opinion*, but of "*facts*," which are incontrovertible, he is able to demonstrate his allegation that the books attributed to the Hebrew lawgiver, although embodying perhaps some fragmentary memorials of the fortunes of this ancient people, are, in the main, false as history, and spurious in a literary sense. This was a most notable achievement, considering the shortness of the time.

The pompous phrases in which the "coming book" was announced were of a sort to suggest the belief that this missionary Bishop, thoroughly conversant, as no doubt he must be, with all matters of biblical criticism, had, to his amazement and dismay, discovered, in some cavern or cleft of a rock in his hitherto unexplored diocese, new and substantial proofs—*facts*, not to be controverted, which yielded demonstration of the falsity of the

Hebrew books. Is it, we asked—is it something quite new in geology? or are we now to learn a new geogony in deciphering the hieroglyphics of another series of "Brass Plates?"

I acknowledge my own simplicity on this occasion, for it appeared to me quite incredible that an announcement *of this sort* should have been made by an instructed clergyman, and by a Bishop, and by Bishop Colenso, when, in simple truth, the "facts" now brought forward by him are absolutely nothing more than so many worn questions in biblical exposition, of which most reading men, lay and clerical, have been cognizant these many years—say forty, or, at the shortest, fifteen years. We—I mean men of the instructed class—may have thought, as to some of the solutions that have hitherto been offered of the difficulties in question, that they were quite sufficient, or entirely satisfactory. Other solutions may have appeared to us not sufficient, or not complete; nevertheless we have clearly seen that, if the alternative were of this sort—that we should accept the problem, *unsolved as yet*, or else reject the biblical history—such a rejection must involve difficulties and contradictions of an incomparably more perplexing kind than any that are implied in accepting this history. That it is so might soon be shown.

How is it, then, that so much precipitancy and indiscretion, and so much blundering too, have come to damage a high reputation? An answer to such a question presents itself on almost every page of this book. Almost every page—certainly every chapter—of it affords an instance, not merely of a strange misapprehension of facts, and of much frivolous criticism, but of an intense feeling, or, as we say, *animus;* and this is the word we use when a speaker or a writer, who is laboring to substantiate a defamation, finds it more than he can do to repress emotions that are not of the most amiable sort, and which he does not choose to avow. There is a smothered heat in this writer's paragraphs whenever he thinks his case good against the defendant. It is manifest that he has a grudge against this Moses, or this Jew of a late age, the author of the Five Books. He exults, therefore, when he professes his own deliverance from all "superstitious" regard to these ancient fabrications. If only we can convince ourselves that they are of "no historic value," then—yes, then—we shall not find ourselves "compelled to believe" this or that, which offends our modern tastes.

There is a deep meaning in all this—a meaning which is visible, although it is glossed over; it is a meaning which has its rise in Dr. Colenso's theology, and is to be traced to his *deductive* Theism; and it cuts deep, and it will yet cut deeper than just now it may, into his Christianity. He himself gives significant hints of the probable consequence of the line of argument upon which he has entered. Already this course of criticism has distanced him many leagues from the latitude and the longitude which was his place on the chart of belief so lately as when he published his Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans. He does not know that he *now* believes what he did believe at that time. If the Bishop be indeed the clear-headed man which he is reputed to be, and the honest man which even those who are the most strongly opposed to him will grant him to be, he will not fail, a year hence, or perhaps in much less time than a year, to discover the logical impracticability of the position which just at this moment he occupies. He foresees, dimly at least, a consequence of this kind; nor is he dismayed at the prospect.

"It will now be apparent," he says, "that there is no longer any cause for superstitious terror in respect to the inquiries we are making." He is confident of his argument, and he intends to pursue it so far as it may touch the other books of the Old Testament Scriptures. But he looks beyond *these* books, and he provides himself with an apology, on the supposition that, after Moses and the Prophets have thus been dealt with, and when the Church shall have been delivered from all terrors in that behalf, we may find ourselves called upon to accept "a new interpretation" of certain passages in the New Testament. In anticipation of this issue, he exclaims, "What the end may be, God only—the God of Truth—can foresee!"

We may admit the propriety of this pious ejaculation, and yet may affirm that the rejection of Christianity, and a collapse upon the most vague form of modern theism, or rather pantheism, is the near-at-hand consequence of a certain course of reasoning. Clear-headed men—Christians and non-Christians alike—will not long stand wavering between two opinions on this ground. At present Dr. Colenso persuades himself that "our belief in the living God remains as sure as ever, though not the Pentateuch only, but the whole Bible, were removed." He thinks that "the precious lesson" we are "to be taught in this our day is, not

to build our faith upon a book, though it be the Bible itself!" Already, as is manifest from his language—ambiguous as this is—all reliance upon writings so largely intermixed "with human elements of error, infirmity, passion, and ignorance," is gone from him; and he will quickly find that those who occupy seats on the extreme left of his present position will allow him no rest so long as he hesitates to apply his method of biblical exposition to the other *quasi* historical books, and then to the Psalms, and to the Prophets; and how will he be able to make a stand at the closing page of the Hebrew Scriptures? No stand can be there made; nor can any stay for the foot be found until the last stage has been reached, and it will be there that he will find himself borne upon by difficulties, in comparison with which, as to their gravity and the somber color which they wear, the difficulties that now meet him in the Mosaic history are trivial indeed. A man must be ignorant of what has been the course of thought in these last days, and he must be ignorant, too, of the history of speculative philosophy, and ignorant of the source and motive of the ancient Gnosticism, and of the Manichæan doctrine, not to foresee the end, which end is now quite near at hand. After "the Book" has been discarded, seasons of blank dismay will come on to those who have thus lost their way; and it will be then that the "voice within the heart—the whisper of the living God, our Father and Friend"—shall be sorrowfully listened for, but shall not be heard. Ought we to expect any other issue? If, indeed, the Living God has spoken to man in "the Book," those who spurn this Book will be left to follow their own way, and to feed upon the wind.

I should not dare to utter prognostications of this sort on the ground merely of momentary religious feeling. The history of minds of high quality, and of the highest culture, is in store for sustaining these conclusions. It is true that instances may be named in which a happier result has followed a state of mind nearly analogous to that which has brought Bishop Colenso into his present false position. A spurious speculative Theism to begin with, and a fastidious moral sensitiveness as its consequence, have driven not a few lofty spirits to the brink of the atheistic abyss; yet some have stayed on the road—short of their own ruin. So did Augustine: but then he held fast to the Book; nevertheless, there remained with him to the end of his course so much of the leaven of this false feeling, that, throughout his

expositions of the patriarchal histories, and of his sermons on the Psalms, he is very often driven to take refuge in the most absurd mystifications as the only means he could adopt for adjusting such spurious notions to the letter of the history. But an instance, which is still more pertinent to the present case, is that of the noble-hearted Origen, the most accomplished and learned of the Fathers, and a martyr too. When Origen allegorized, it was not because his own turn of mind was fanciful and his genius inventive, for it was not so, although this has often been said; but because he was driven into myths by the dire necessity, as he thought, of escaping from the historical sense of the patriarchal narratives, which so greatly shocked his hyperspiritual tastes. He did not reject the Hebrew Scriptures as if their Divine origination were questionable: far was he from falling into this impiety; but he put upon the language of the Bible histories a non-natural meaning for the saving of his religious fastidiousness. Dr. Colenso, moved in a similar manner, steps boldly forward in an opposite direction, and he denies, not only the inspiration of the Mosaic books, but their historic value. It is on *this* ground that we should look to the quality of the reasoning on the strength of which he has risked so much, and has risked it in so hurried a manner.

Of what *quality*, then, are those reasonings on the strength of which Bishop Colenso has risked so much, and has risked it so inconsiderately? I must briefly say they are of that quality which, in the long run, will not fail to establish and to confirm the very conclusions they are intended to destroy. It may be shown—and, so far as this may be done within the compass of a few pages, I hope to show it—that several of the exceptions to the Mosaic history upon which Dr. Colenso insists, and which he goes about to establish by his inapplicable calculations, are precisely of the kind which a mind of more grasp and comprehension would seize upon as the most significant evidences of the truthfulness of that history, and especially as indications of its *cotemporaneousness*.

Only let the case in hand be removed from the shelter of religious jurisdiction—let the suit be carried down into the open court of secular historic criticism, and then it will become manifest that the pleas of the plaintiff (or several of them) are *con-*

vertible in an opposite sense, and may be laid hold of by the counsel for the defense. For making good this counter-plea, it will be requisite to call attention to those characteristics of the people whose history is in doubt, which are so much the more deserving of regard because we catch them *incidentally* in following that history through the long track of forty centuries. These remarkable characteristics of the Hebrew race may not always have received the attention that is due to them, as affording a key to some biblical problems; and yet, in taking them into account, we do nothing more than what is done, in like cases, on other fields of historical inquiry.

But how is it that it can be needful to remind a highly-educated man of these elementary and well-known principles? An answer can not be given to this question without adverting to the fact that a narrowness of view—a sideway blindness—right and left—has often been the misfortune of those who have signalized their ability on single lines of mathematical science. Very eminent minds have shown this want of breadth or grasp. Such men may be mathematicians, but philosophers they are not; and so it is that the same quality which constitutes their eminence while they are on the single path which they tread, shows itself only as pedantry whenever they step off from that path. Men of this order are peculiarly unfitted for conducting inquiries of a mixed historic kind, and which should embrace a knowledge of human nature not only as it is reported in books, but also as it is to be learned in the open world. The author of this volume is not only singularly limited in his range of sight, but he appears (judging him only by his book) incapable of estimating the relative magnitude of objects in the moral world. *Sensitive* he is in a most extreme degree (we are used to apply the term *morbid* to this kind of irritable vitality); but as to that consciousness of a loftier and calmer sort which apprehends and which takes to the true and sublime in the world of action, it is out of his range.

A narrow range of vision, when combined with sensitive impulsiveness, is sure to bring with it much argumentative confusion. A writer of this order is seen to be forgetting what it is that he intends to reach as his conclusion; or, as we colloquially say, he "does not know what he would be driving at." Much of the reasoning of this volume would be quite proper, if the author's single object were to show the necessity of a relaxation of the

terms of clerical subscription; and other portions of it would be fairly admissible in contravention of certain doctrines concerning the mode and the extent of the Inspiration of the Scriptures; but scarcely any of it is appropriate if it be intended to prove that the so-called Pentateuchal history is "non-historical and untrue." If it be not true, and consequently if it is not inspired, and if, as a further consequence, we—as the Bishop says we may be—are relieved from the "incubus" of religious apprehensions in dealing with it, and are freed from superstitions of all kinds, then, clearly, the matters in question are to be dealt with according to the rules and practices of historic criticism, *and in no other manner:* they are not to be treated intermixedly—sometimes as if we had an Inspired Book under our hands, and then, in the next moment, as if it were the fabrication of some unknown and ignorant writer. Here, then, I demand argumentative consistency. Choose your ground once for all, and keep to it. As an instance of the confusion that besets the way of one who is not yet reconciled to his own inferences, and who is haunted by a fear that the matters he is treating so freely are, perhaps, after all, invested with divine authority, we may adduce the marvelous argument set forth in the fourth chapter, on the dimensions of the Tabernacle, and of the court in the midst of which it stood.

We are told in the Book of Leviticus, chapter viii, that "the assembly was gathered unto the door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation." But this would be impossible; no such thing could be done. Here is a million of people, or more, to be crammed into a space that is barely sufficient for fifty! Eager to demonstrate this impossibility, I snatch my slate and slate-pencil; nor shall I fail to make good my case against Moses, against the Pentateuch, and against what not besides; for I have twenty instances that are of the same solid quality in store. What is it that can be said in reply to reasoning of this quality? Nothing can be said, unless one might be free to trench upon the decorum that is due to a dignitary of the Church. It is certain that, if I had opened upon this very chapter *in an anonymous book*, I should have closed it the next moment, with the exclamation, "When will pedantry and impertinence have spent themselves in these frivolous assaults upon the Bible?"

Julius Cæsar does not anywhere affirm that, on a certain occa-

sion, he had marshaled five Roman legions in a kitchen-garden. But if, in fact, the author of the Commentaries had affirmed any thing of this sort, the mode of dealing with the difficulty thence arising would not be, either, on the one hand, to discard so distinct and so grave a narrative as false and unhistorical, or, on the other hand, to go about laboriously calculating the area of the largest Roman garden of which we have any account; as, for example, that of the younger Pliny; and then to reckon how many Roman soldiers, allowing a square yard to each, might *possibly* have stood upon the space. To take any such course as this, in any parallel instance, would be, if it were not sheer folly, sheer pedantry.

If a writer's manner is uniformly grave and prosaic; if, in speaking of things which were familiarly known to his cotemporaries, and if, in describing natural objects, or buildings, or inclosures, he is at once distinct, brief, and *elliptical;* if, in a word, the document bears upon it the well-known characteristics of genuineness, reality, and honest intention; and if we find in such a document some affirmation which is not intelligible in the sense in which, at first, we read it; if it be so, then our resource is found in common sense and modesty. Supposing, first, the *text* to be uncorrupt, then we assume it as certain that the phrases which, as they stand, need explanation, carried a conventional meaning, with which we of this age are not acquainted. Or, otherwise—and this is always a probable supposition—that certain modes of action, certain usages, proper to ancient and Oriental peoples, but long ago forgotten, or strange to Western notions, would, if known, remove every shadow of difficulty from the passage: five words, perhaps, if we had them, might be enough, or more than enough, to dispel the cloud; or even one word might suffice for this purpose.

I undertake to prove that the Koran, as we have it, is a forgery—I see it must be the work of an ignorant Western monk. How so? I thus prove it: this Koran enjoins daily and abundant ablutions upon all followers of the Prophet, besides many washings on special occasions; but now, if the writer had indeed been an Oriental, if he had been a true son of the desert, he would have known that these wanderers in the wilderness spend their days mostly in a waterless waste: weeks pass in which they scarcely see water. What is to become, then, of these daily ab-

lutions? One word is here enough to open up the mystery—*sand!* when no *water* is to be had, these washings are effected with sand. It is true that Mohammed does explicitly allow this substitution, but the objector might not have hit upon the passage. The ground of this degree of critical modesty is reasonable, and, indeed, without it, our path through the tangled ways of antiquity would be quite impracticable; and if I did not fear bringing upon myself also the imputation of pedantry, I should be fain to fill many pages of this pamphlet with instances in point, drawn from the prolegomena, and the foot-notes of the great critical annotators upon the historic remains of antiquity. This sort of illustration must be here omitted. In truth, if it were adduced, there is no doubt a scholar-like man, such as Dr. Colenso, would indignantly say: "We know all this—this is school-boy stuff: why thrust it upon us in a grave argument?" Why, indeed, unless it should appear that this accomplished writer shows himself to be forgetful now of what once he must well have known? But how does he go about to prove that the Pentateuchal history is false? He is careful to tell us that the whole width of the Tabernacle was ten cubits or eighteen feet, and that, allowing two feet in width for each full-grown man, nine men could just have stood in front of it. Supposing, then, that all the congregation of adult males in the prime of life had given due heed to the Divine summons, and had hastened to take their stand, side by side as closely as possible, in front, not merely of the *door*, but of the whole *end* of the Tabernacle in which the door was, they would have reached, allowing eighteen inches between each rank of nine men, for a distance of more than 100,000 feet—in fact, nearly *twenty miles!*

The painstaking author then goes on to calculate the area of the *court* of the Tabernacle, and gravely asks how we can make standing-room for so many myriads of men in this court, who, in truth, in any mode of packing, must have reached nearly four miles! The area of the court, he says, was 1,800 square yards, but the whole congregation would have covered an area of 201,180 square yards! He thus concludes this unanswerable demonstration, and says: "It is inconceivable how, under such circumstances, all the assembly, the whole congregation, could have been summoned to attend at the door of the Tabernacle by the express command of Almighty God." It follows, therefore,

and Bishop Colenso is sure of it, that the so-called books of Moses are of no historic value, and that the Bible is, as he says, "largely infused with human elements of error, infirmity, passion, and ignorance." Neither miracle, nor arithmetic, nor nonsense, needs to be brought in to solve a problem of this sort. I should think it a folly to enter upon counter calculations, intended to show how many men might *possibly* be brought in front of the door of the Tabernacle. Or I might argue on the probable suggestion that the hangings of the *court* of the Tabernacle—called "fine twined linen"—were, in fact, a net-work, allowing the outstanding people to be spectators of whatever was enacted within the court. But I should think time and pains ill-spent in any such wiry argumentation. If just now some quite new suggestion were to turn up, and were spoken of as sufficient and complete, there is no doubt I should listen to it; but I should not *eagerly* listen to it, nor listen to it with any sort of religious anxiety. I do not much care whether this mountain is moved out of my path or not. If at last I should be persuaded to throw away my Bible, or should come to think of it after Dr. Colenso's fashion, it will not be at the bidding of arguments, which I resent as not more irreligious than they are frivolous, nugatory, and preposterous. I must return to this instance further on.

But it may be well to adduce one other example of this same species of reasoning; and it should be borne in mind that Dr. Colenso's course of argument is not placed before us as *probable suggestions;* for, from beginning to end, it is a *strict demonstration:* it is *a chain*, which is either good for every thing, or else it is good for nothing. I think it is good for nothing!

In his fifth chapter Dr. Colenso affirms—and he says he can prove it—that no man, whether it were Moses, or Joshua, or some other, could make himself heard, at one time, by two or three millions of people! Only think of what is implied in any such supposition as this! "Surely," he says, "no human voice, unless strengthened by miracle, of which the Scripture tells us nothing, could have reached the ears of a crowded mass of people, as large as the whole population of London:" and, moreover, he reminds his readers of the fact—a fact which no paterfamilias will be likely to deny—that the mere crying of the babies in such an assemblage "must have sufficed to drown the sounds

(of a single human voice) at only a few yards' distance." Is not this demonstration? Does one need to be skilled in Hebrew—that "difficult language"—before one can feel the overwhelming force of it? To this instance, also, I must revert.

In the next chapter, the author again goes into his irresistible arithmetic in proof of his position that the Mosaic narrative is altogether unhistorical. As thus: "We can not well allow for a *living* man, with room for his cooking, sleeping, and other necessaries and conveniencies of life, less than three or four times the space required for a *dead* one in his grave, and even then the different ages and sexes would be very disagreeably crowded together." But the Bishop is reasonable in his postulates, and, therefore, in measuring out the Hebrew necropolis in the wilderness, he is content to reckon at the moderate rate, for a full-grown man, of a coffin measuring six feet by two feet. What, then, are the priests—three men only—to do, whose duty it was to carry the refuse of the sacrifices beyond the limits of the camp, and of the necropolis, and all? I need not quote the paragraphs that follow. If this mode of reasoning is valid at all, less than a tenth part of it would be more than enough. For brevity sake, I here refer to calculations of the same order, occurring at some distance in this volume. Thus chapter twenty treats of the number of the priests at the Exodus, compared with their duties, and the provision made for them. It was impossible, he says, that three men—Aaron and his two sons—should have performed offices for which three hundred would barely have been enough.

I have already expressed my feeling, prompted by the perusal of this book, that Bishop Colenso, strict and demonstrative as he is on a single line of reasoning, is entirely wanting in that breadth of mind or philosophic comprehension which his argument calls for, and without which nothing can be done on the field of historic criticism. Much less can any good be done on this field by one who is at once frightened and angry, and who hastens onward through the narrow, briery lane of his figures in the manner of a man that has seen a ghost, and is afraid to turn his head, right hand or left hand, lest he should again catch a glimpse of the goblin.

I now take the leave which he gives me to stand excused from all restraints of religious dread or superstitious reverence for

the Bible. This liberty is what I would wish for in taking in hand the nugatory reasoning of which we have samples now before us.

The books of the Pentateuch, thus made to stand on their own merits, are to be taken as the memorials of the Birth—*first*, of a *People*, and *then*—of a NATION. No memorials altogether comparable to these have come down from ancient to modern times. In so far as these documents are in analogy with parallel documents, they work into adjustment with all that we know of Oriental antiquity, and of human nature everywhere. But in so far as they differ from all such instances, the difference is a difference available in proof of their reality, their genuineness, their authenticity: it is so by reason of the gravity and exactness of the matters at large, and of the matters in detail. A perusal of these books—the so-called Mosaic archives—carries, in minds not debilitated by sophisms, an irresistible conviction of truthfulness: there is a majesty here, before which we bow. Just now I have been persuaded to lay aside my superstition—my feelings of religious awe. I have done so; I have brought these venerable writings into fresh and sharp contrast with other documents or memorials of antiquity, with which I am not unacquainted. It is impossible to me, when looking at them in this cold and "dry light," to imagine that I have before me—what can it be?—a vast congeries of inventions—a thousand Arabian tales—a conglomerate of the vapid extravagancies of base spirits, busy in contriving a fraud! There is nothing in this world, there is nothing in all history that is real, if, indeed, I have not in these books what I have here affirmed, namely, the various, yet the coherent and consecutive, memorials and the authentic documents of the Birth of a Nation, as to its civil and its religious institutions.

But if now we have before us the polity and the institutions, religious and secular, of a Great People, this question presents itself: What the People was as to its native characteristics? And this other question must also be answered: In the use of what methods are we to reach our conclusions concerning it? Often and often again have the Hebrew people been judged of on the partial ground of our ordinary religious assumptions concerning them: and also on the ground of irreligious and malignant assumptions. But these estimates, framed on either of these

grounds, are now to be kept out of sight; and assuredly, if *religious superstitions* are to be discarded, so, also, should we discard *irreligious* prejudices, and these haunt the region. A nation, whether ancient or modern, can be fairly judged of in no other manner than by instituting some comparisons. Looked at, when brought into position side by side with other races or peoples that were its cotemporaries (if we can find such), what face does it show? What are the recurrent characteristics of the stock? These features of the people are to be looked for, not in the formal encomiums of its own writers, or in the reports of its applauded historians; nor yet shall we be content to take our notions from the calumnies of its enemies. The characteristics of *a Race* will best be gathered from the unintended representations which come up to the surface again and again in its history, and which are marked in its institutions, and which give a color to the mass of documents that constitute its authentic literature, through the lapse of centuries.

Scarcely any risk of material error attends a method of this kind; and, in fact, it has been pursued without scruple in modern times, and its results have been fully admitted in relation to each of the foremost nations of antiquity. These modern judgments as to Greece and Rome are now worn subjects. But our western and modern civilization has received its impulse, not from Greece and Rome only, but from the ancient people of Palestine also, and, indeed, from these last mainly. This inherited influence has not been confined to the impartation of a religion; for the Hebrew mind has entered very largely among the constituents of our secular civilization, and its presence may be traced where least we might imagine it to exist. This suffused influence needs only to be pointed out to be recognized; and, just now, there is a need that it should be recognized.

It is trite to say that the Hellenic people, and these without a rival, possessed the Instinct of Symmetry and the consciousness of Beauty. This prerogative of the race developed itself, not only in matchless works of Art—in its Sculpture and its Architecture, but also in its Abstract and Speculative Philosophy. Symmety in FORM, on the one hand, and Symmetry in THOUGHT, on the other hand—these were the two excellent products of the one endowment of the Race.

It is also trite to say that the Roman stock—whencesoever

derived—signalized itself in a wholly different manner. The Race-endowment of the Roman People was the Instinct of ORDER—order *Dynamic;* and this distinction evolved itself in the several modes of administrative ability. The outspeak of this gift was command; its passion was power; its means was military organization, and its result was extended empire.

In thus following the method of comparison, we find the distinctive characteristic of the Hebrew Race—the Stock out of which the Nation at length rose to be—the Instinct of ORDER; not *dynamic*, as the Roman, but STATICAL ORDER; and, as such, it has suffused itself in different degrees among the modern European nations.

This Instinct of *statical* Order, as the endowment of the Hebrew Race, the evidences of which are marked and unquestionable, evolved itself in its clanship, carried out with a rigorous adherence to its principle; and also in adjustments, and in administrative managements, and in fitnesses, either among material objects, or in the constantly recurrent operations of life ecclesiastical, or life secular. *Order in position*, order in daily observances: order was the law of a tranquil, a peaceful, a regulated, and unambitious perpetuity. Thus it stood contrasted with the Roman *dynamic* order, the law of which was restlessness, onward movement, and progress. May we here look back for a moment toward the ancestry of our European (and especially of our English) life—our life intellectual, our life practical, our life æsthetic, and our life social and domestic. The Hellenic Instinct has its extant vouchers among us, in whatsoever we do for satiating the lust of the eye; and also in whatsover we say and write for satiating the appetite of a higher reason. As to the Roman Instinct, the extant vouchers of its existence among us are to be found in the voluminous facts of a foreign domination, upon which the sun never sets. As to the instinct of *statical* order, which had its first development in the ancient Palestine, it shows itself in the settled habitudes and decorums of our social life, in the seemly reverences of our religious life, in our firm class distinctions, in our aristocratic manners and sentiments, in our fixed conservatism, and in our strong monarchical preference.

Enough, or more than enough, has been written in illustration of the well-understood characteristics of the Grecian and of the

Roman mind. There may, however, be room for a page in illustration of what is here affirmed concerning the equally well-defined characteristic of the Hebrew mind. I think, moreover, that, if a due regard be paid to this less-worn subject, it will take effect in disposing of most of the nugatory exceptions which are now set in array against the truth and reality of the Mosaic records. Five or six, at least, of the difficulties which show so formidable a front in the view of Dr. Colenso, will thus be fairly disposed of at a sweep; and, if so, our responsibility will be concluded as to a full half of his book. This or that narrative of events is, he says, incredible; this or that institution, or mode of proceeding, must have been "impossible;" and, therefore, the writings affirming such things must be rejected as fabulous. Not so; or not so to those who have freshness and freedom of thought enough to look at the Mosaic institutions, and generally at the Hebrew writings, under the open sky of universal history; not so, if we have philosophic grasp enough to apprehend *the national quality of this one People;* not so, if, in our habits of study, we have pushed inquiry beyond the Biblical inclosure, and have learned whatever may be learned, or may be gathered, either from contiguous fields, or from sources of information of later date. You confidently tell us that certain operations, ecclesiastical or civil, must be rejected as impossible, or as insufferable, if possible. I can not consent to think of things in this small and bookish manner; for I am not uninformed concerning Oriental modes of life. I have conversed with those who well know Egypt, and Palestine, and the East. I have come to understand that, in a hundred instances, the very thing which we might pronounce to be "demonstrably impossible," is, nevertheless, actually done! Theory, and arithmetic, and prejudice in heaps, disappear as the chaff of the threshing-floor when the morning breeze sets every thing in motion.

Take now in hand, as if it were for the first time, the *three* Pentateuchal books—Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers; or call these three books one collection of the intermixed narratives, civil institutions, religious observances, and the therewith-connected descriptions of the Church structures and the appointments of the Hebrew people. While you examine these documents, keep in mind the *condition*, subject to which we are to pursue our inquiry. We say: If these institutions are from God,

in the sense which is claimed on their behalf, and if the history be true in the same sense, *then* our controversy respecting the whole matter is at an end—a verdict may be taken for the defendant; and it must be for the plaintiff to pay the costs of the suit. But, if otherwise, then, and in that case, these institutions, and these laws, and these religious ceremonials *are from man;* in other words, they *represent the people*, for they are *of* the people; and, according to the admitted methods of historical criticism, they are available as vouchers for whatever they indicate as to the manners and dispositions of the race.

It is manifest that, in whatever way so strange an event had come about, a vast multitude—mainly the men of one race, but not wholly so—had come to spread itself up and down through the Wadys of the Sinaitic peninsula—a great multitude indeed, but it was not a crowd. This people, by the fixed usages of centuries, had long ago divided and subdivided itself, on the patriarchal platform, into clans, and these clans into families, and the chief of each clan had his subordinates, and each family had its head, and the head had his subalterns. Each separate tribe constituting this people was swathed in ancestral loyalties—in its own traditions—in its rivalries. The mass was thoroughly an *organic mass;* and the cementing principle possessed binding energy enough to afford ample security against any wide-spread confusion or social disintegration. Seditions might and did spring up here and there; but there would not occur a national chaos. Recent national sufferings had imparted strength to every bond; and, in a word, as if in preparation for the shocks and throes of the new life in the desert, the Hebrew instinct of order—*statical*—had recently become intense in a degree that had not before been known.

This people—and we need not now care to ask whether, with its camp followers, it was a million strong, or two millions, or was not nearly so many—this people had become wealthy—not in herds only, but in all kinds of personal appointments. It possessed the costumes and the decorations of superfluous wealth. The mechanical and the decorative arts had long been in practice among them: quite familiar were they with the luxuries of an advanced material civilization; and they were adepts in the laborious arts of common life. The movable wealth of the people, and the appurtenances of rank, they had brought with them.

As to the wealth they had created upon the Egyptian soil, they received from their masters a bare tithe of its value in jewelry. These were the visible or exterior conditions of this ousted multitude.

But the people had also their inner habitudes, and these got expression in the tone and purport of those ordinances—in those regulations, mixedly religious and secular—in those forecasting appointments, which were to be carried out, years later, in a land of rest. In all these legal elements, whether sacred or civil, the Race-instinct makes itself manifest; and thus, also, was it in the specialties, and in the measurements, and in the fitting of every hook to its eye, and of every cord to its pole, and of every vessel to its use, and of every movement to its movement—every thing was in harmony with, and was an expression of, statical order. This might be proved at large, if space and time were just now at command. But now read the book of Numbers with this key in your hand; and while keeping in view analogous instances, occurring in later histories, give license for a moment to the imagination, while you bring before you, by the various aids of modern travel and of pictorial illustration, *first*, the Sinaitic scenery which the people were at this moment leaving; and then the broad expanses of the northward table-land—the wilderness of Paran. I see, I see as if I were carried back through the forty centuries—I see the host, for it is just now pushing its upward way through the passes of Jebel et Tih, and it is fanning itself out, in a predetermined order, upon the flats of this upland. What I see is not a rout, is not a rabble, is not a promiscuous crowd or horde; it is not a deluge of struggling, countless human forms; but it is a sample of what may be done in marshaling the millions of a people *whose native instinct is order*, and whose daily habitudes render conformity thereto far more easy to them than confusion could be.

"Who is this that looketh forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, terrible as an army with banners?" Thus I read the record: "When the cloud rested in the wilderness of Paran, and the host tóok their journey according to the commandment of the Lord, by the hand of Moses. In the first place went the standard of the camp of Judah, according to their armies: and over his host was Nahshon, the son of Amminadab"—and so, and so, on, and on, and on, in their turns, came all the tribes

and families of Israel. "Thus were the journeyings of the sons of Israel according to their armies, when they set forward."

Now, if such passages do not breathe the very life of reality—if they be not pre-eminently exact and *historical*, then there is nothing true, there is nothing real, in all the hundred folios upon which our modern industry has employed itself these three centuries past. Not only are these Pentateuchal records manifestly real and true, but they carry with them, to the conviction of every unsophisticated mind, that inimitable impression of grandeur, that aspect of sublimity which no art can counterfeit, and which arises of itself to accompany and to signalize those notable occasions when the movements of vast multitudes of the human family are seen to be governed, in tranquil silence, by an instinctive sense of order. Here now before us a Great People is outspreading its ranks—bright and banner-led, upon a scene fitting the action. The stony plain may vibrate far beneath the measured tread of these millions of men; but as the heaven above them is clear, and as the One Cloud sharply outlines itself against the burning azure, so are the human masses free from din and uproar, or confusion—One voice in front is listened to, and this is the utterance:

"And when the ark set forward, Moses said, Rise up, Lord, and let thine enemies be scattered; and let them that hate thee flee before thee. And when it rested, he said, Return, O Lord, unto the many thousands of Israel."

Again and again, in the course of centuries, individuals—the representative men, as we say, of this Hebrew race—come out in the bright distinctness of familiar incidents; and whenever this happens, there comes up to view this same distinction of the race, namely, this instinct of fitness. In citing two or more of these instances, I ask, and I have a purpose in asking it, that the well-known texts should be stripped of their religious phraseology, and that the neological equivalents for these pious terms should be freely admitted in their stead. Let the reader make the substitution for himself: "And the Lord was with Joseph (a Hebrew youth) and he was a prosperous man, and his master saw that the Lord was with him, and that the Lord made all that he did to prosper in his hand. . . . And his master made him overseer over his house, and all that he had he put into his hand." But this blameless slave was soon the victim of calumny and

malice: he lost his stewardship, but not his nature. This inborn gift of administrative ability—this serviceable tact—this genius for doing things in the very best manner—this faculty which we all welcome so gladly, when it comes in to do its office in some scene of confusion—this prerogative of the race showed itself as if it had been a natural phosphorescence, and soon it gladdened the dismal walls of a prison. As it had been in the mansion, so it was in the dungeon, for "the keeper of the prison looked not to any thing that was under his hand, because the Lord was with Joseph, and that which he did the Lord made it to prosper;" and, as in the prison, so was it in the palace: and Pharaoh said unto his servants, "Can we find such a one as this is—a man in whom the Spirit of God is?" And thus this Hebrew youth came to be clad royally, and went forth throughout all the land of Egypt to order all things at his will, "to bind (its) princes at his pleasure, and teach its senators wisdom."

The lapse of a thousand years finds the Hebrew men, who also were captives, serving the great and noble in a strange land—always the same men, and they are sought after, and are put in authority, because "there were none like them" among a hundred rivals; so we read; "then the king made Daniel a great man, and gave him many gifts, and made him ruler over the whole province of Babylon, and chief of the governors over all the wise men of Babylon." Years afterward he was still noted at court "as the man in whom was the spirit of the holy gods;" and still later, this Daniel was preferred above the presidents and princes, because an excellent spirit—that is to say, *the faculty of administrative management*—was in him, "and the king thought to set him over the whole realm."

Facts, incidentally mentioned, yet all bearing the same meaning, as illustrative of the national faculty, might be brought forward from the histories of the Priest Ezra and of the Prince Nehemiah. The book of Ezra, after its preamble, gives significant evidence to the same effect, for it contains enumerations, catalogues, inventories; and these are precisely the sort of documents which attach always to the doings of those who are eminently *men of order*. Thus runs the record—"thirty charges of gold, etc., nine-and-twenty knives; all the vessels of gold and of silver were five thousand and four hundred." Then follows the muster-roll of the people of the captivity that returned to

their land; and in genuine style—the people and their modes of action considered, the catalogue includes the horses, the mules, the camels, and the asses of the caravan. The spirit of *management*, the practicable assortments, the appointments in detail of the persons and their duties, every thing speaks of that prevalence of method which now is what we have in view, and a knowledge of which is the key to a large part of the Pentateuchal history.

I may not fill the pages of a pamphlet with chapters from the Bible; instead of this I ask the reader—I ask any of my lay-brethren—to turn to the third chapter of the book of Nehemiah, and to say whether we are not rightly interpreting the various documents of this people—the memorials of their brighter days, and the memorials of their darkest days, in the sense I am now affirming: it was a people instinct with the feeling, and habituated to the practice of fitness; it was a people which, refractory and obdurate as it might be in its moods, conformed itself always, *with a natural ease*, to every arrangement, the end of which was to secure a silent decorum in ceremonies, and a good issue in the most arduous and hazardous operations. Thus I interpret Nehemiah's narrative of the arrangements made for rebuilding the walls of the desolated city. Thus, also, I read the closing verses of the fourth chapter, and thus I read, also, those passages of the eighth chapter—vividly historical as they are, and applicable, too, in refutation of some of the nugatory exceptions that now are bolstered up on futile calculations.

Many instances, available for the same purpose, must be passed over; they will occur to the recollection of every Bible-reader. Others must also be omitted which arise in the course of the history of the Jewish people during the centuries intervening between the close of the Old and the opening of the New dispensation. As to some which are adducible from the Rabbinical literature—earlier and later—they have a meaning in relation to the present argument which well entitles them to a brief but emphatic notice, further in this argument.

We open the New Testament, and with this same idea in view, we look to the manner of action, and to the demeanor, on peculiar occasions, of HIM of whom it is said, not only that He became man, and dwelt among us, but also that He "took on Him *the seed of Abraham*." The Savior of all nations was the

man of *his own people*: and, while full of that spirit of order which prevails in the highest heaven, He gave evidence also, whenever the occasion called for it, of the national tact which was his as a Jew. When about to act as CREATOR in the fullest sense, even as when worlds were made, this JESUS was not unmindful of method. One Evangelist says: "He commanded the men to sit down, and there was much grass in the place;" another adds this word: "to sit down by companies," and says, moreover, that the people sat down "in ranks, by hundreds and by fifties, upon the green grass;" another adds: "He said to his disciples, Make them to sit down by fifties in a company." In these instances there was present, not only a certain mode of action in the PRINCIPAL, for there was, also, the ready and native habitudes of the twelve assistants; and, moreover, there were the national habitudes of this hungry multitude. All things here show the same color—all is properly Jewish. One may easily think of crowds or mobs—a hungry eight or ten thousand men, women, and children, as to whom the mere endeavor to marshal them in companies—the telling-off the bands—the making them all sit in line—the preserving of clear passages—these adjustments would demand a miracle almost as great as the feeding them to the full: but it was not so in this Jewish multitude. And were not the fragments of food carefully gathered up, and stowed away, and the baskets counted?

Let leave be given to bring upon this page—and I do it with awe—one closing instance of that Jewish instinct of fitness and decorum which is the most remarkable that can be imagined. We are told that, on the morning of the resurrection, Peter saw the linen clothes lying, and the napkin that had been about the head "not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped together in a place by itself."*

If now these miscellaneous references to the people's history were not enough, they might be multiplied and set in array with care. I think they will seem enough for bearing up the inference I draw from them: that from the very earliest age in which its characteristic dispositions come into view, the Hebrew race and nation, and the Jewish people in continuance, were, as dis-

* *Apart*—folded, or rather rolled up—in its place.

tinguished from other races, habituated to the fittest modes of conducting any public, consentaneous action; and, moreover, that they were seldom, if ever, wanting in skilled leaders, who well knew how to give effect in the best manner to this excellent quality in their people. These chiefs were far-seeing and *provident: in matters of detail* they were exact; in ceremonial they were tranquil, self-possessed, careful, and, perhaps, jealous of established distinctions: vividly alive were they to the reciprocal claims and duties of clanship. This was a people among whom, and with whom, operations the most difficult, or seemingly impracticable, would be matters of course, and always easy in the performance. Our inference *at large* is here divisible in *two;* and, by thus dividing it, it becomes more distinct and conclusive: it affects, first, what must be called the *legal style* of the people's *enactments;* and then the style, also, of their narrations of particular events, or public acts, as thus: What we should expect to find as the prevailing style of the statutes, the ordinances, the regulative canons, whether civil or ecclesiastical, of a people whose inherited dispositions were of the sort which we find to be characteristic of this race, is this: namely, that a rule will be conveyed in its most condensed or comprehensive terms—omitting those adaptations, in detail, which the settled habits of the people, and the stated modes of official persons, would always supply: *adaptations* there would be room for in accordance with exigencies of time, place, and other inevitable limitations: the *rule* is to be reasonably and necessarily understood. The law or the ordinance, in each instance, embodies the main purport—the intention—or the *final cause* of the enactment. This final cause was ever to be kept in view. As to the mode or means of observance, the good sense of the officials, and the national aptitudes of the people, might safely be relied upon for fitting the action to the occasion. In any instance, therefore, if we fail to find, in the Book of the Law, what may seem to ourselves a needful specification for the guidance of official persons, *this very omission* (to *us moderns* it may seem an omission) is what, if it be properly understood, should be taken as a conclusive evidence of the genuineness of the document in which it occurs. In proof of the correctness of this mode of understanding the case, the traditions of the Rabbinical literature—the Talmud and Mishna—afford many illustrations.

Thus far as to the *Ordinances* of the Pentateuchal Books. An analogous application of the same principle in explanation of the brevity and the elliptical style of the Pentateuchal *Histories* will go far to aid us in finding a solution of the problems (or puzzles, rather) which have so easily robbed Dr. Colenso of his faith in the Scriptures.

In the Mosaic narratives of great events, and of stated public transactions, what is *given* is—*the upshot of the action*, or of the movement, or ceremonial. The things that are omitted are nothing else than those matters of course—those constant Hebrew modes of doing what was done, with which this people had been immemorially familiar, and a formal mention of which would have been quite a redundance. Here, again, the very same instances which, in the view of Dr. Colenso, stand up as insurmountable difficulties, or as conclusive reasons for treating the narrative as a fabrication, appear to me, and so I think they will appear to every calm-minded reader, as significant evidences of its truthfulness, and especially as proofs of the *cotemporaneousness of the document*

If now the reader will please to accept these two rules of interpretation as warrantable, he will, I think, find that they furnish the key to each of the instances upon which Dr. Colenso insists in his own demonstrative manner, as thus: *The historic meaning* of the passage upon which, in his fourth chapter, he dwells with so much eager intensity, is very clear; or, if it were not clear, it could not be taken as an evidence of falsification or of spuriousness, for it is not of that quality; it is only (if it be not understood) a solecism, or it is an idiom of which the equivalent is not now extant—*non habent lexica*—that is all we are entitled to say of it, at the worst.

But, in fact, the real meaning is conspicuous. The consecration of Aaron and his sons to their high functions in the service of the Tabernacle was not to be *a matter of the conclave*—it was not to be an affair that should be enacted *with closed doors*. On the contrary, the laity at large—even the princes of the people—the heads of clans and of families, were to have cognizance, in the freest manner, of what Moses, on the part of JEHOVAH, was to do in setting apart his brother and nephews to this function—a function which was to be hereditary and incommunicable.

"And the assembly was gathered together at the door of the

Tabernacle of the congregation." In what mode and *order* this was done, we are not informed, nor need we care much to inquire. The chiefs of the people, and their subalterns, also, knew well what they were about; and the people under their guidance knew, also, in what way they should answer to the call, and how they should follow the banner of their tribe. The substantial purpose was effected—the consecration of the Aaronic family was participated in by the Great Ecclesia. All was, therefore, valid and authentic; and a record of this transaction—*an entry*, accordingly, is made in the very heart of the ordinance thereto relating. If now I could have any doubt—which, in fact, I can not admit—that this is the proper historic interpretation of the passage in question, I should turn for confirmation of it to those places in the Rabbinical writings where the Hebrew modes of managing public acts are set forth with tedious specialty. But if this method be reasonable, then what place is found for Dr. Colenso's calculation about the eighteen feet and the twenty miles, and the so forth? This array of arithmetic, so unwisely insisted upon, seems to me more frivolous than any thing that is the most puerile in the Rabbinical expositions.

Take another instance, which is the next in order of these formidable applications of school arithmetic to Biblical interpretation. It is set forth in the fifth chapter of this volume: (I have already referred to it, but must bring it forward anew for a moment.) It is asked: How could Moses or Joshua make himself heard by two or three millions of people? Only think of any one haranguing the population of the metropolitan districts!—impossible! If impossible, then we may be sure it was not done. Nevertheless, that *was done* which had been really embraced in the intention of the Divine command; and which, moreover, the established usages of the people made practicable and easy. "Moses called all Israel, and said unto them;" and again, "Joshua read before all the congregation of Israel, with the women, and the little ones, and the strangers that were conversant among them, all the words of the law, the blessings and the cursings according to all that which is written in the Book of the Law."

To a mind that is in a healthy condition—indeed, to any mind not laboring under a dangerous infatuation, these archaic passages, recommended as they are by the very tone of reality and

truth, barely ask the aid of the expositor. The *intention* is manifest; and there are counterpart passages, occurring in the midst of the narrative, which well expound the other, in putting before us what was the Divine purpose in these instances. There was to be an oral instruction of the people—none excepted—in that law, in the faithful observance of which stood their welfare as a nation, and as individual men. This publication of the Law, first, under the canopy of heaven, was to be followed up by a practice of domestic instruction so extensive, and of such penetrative force as must (had it been adhered to) have secured to the people at large, and to each member of this national Church, their permanent welfare, secular and spiritual. "So shall it be well with thee. And these words which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart, and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up. And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes; and thou shalt write them upon the posts of thy house, and on thy gates."

With this passage before me, I could easily furnish Dr. Colenso with notes for a supplementary chapter to his book on the Pentateuch. Write the Law of Moses on the posts of a house-door?—impossible! The utmost extent that can be allowed for the door-posts of the Jewish houses is not more than—how many square inches? It is true that the Lord's Prayer and the Commandments have been written within the compass of a silver penny. But is it really intended that the whole of three or four books of the Pentateuch should be thus microscopically inscribed upon Jewish door-posts? If written so small as this, who could read them? We conclude, therefore, that the books containing impracticable injunctions such as these are worthy of no regard!

Listen to these grave and impressive passages in another and a better mood: they *are* historical, if there be any thing historical among the memorials of past ages. These passages, stamped as they are with sacredness, are, also, eminently *national*. This is, indeed, Hebrew of the Hebrews; and these injunctions have passed down, woven into the manners and the traditions of this stereotype race, even to these last days: the *spirit* of them too much forgotten—the *letter* too slavishly observed.

In any instance in which either the oral instruction of the people, or the people's participation in solemn acts of worship, is in question, it is enough for us, at this distance of time, to know that arrangements, fitting the occasion, managements, effective marshalings of the people, and whatever else of this sort might be needed, was quite the faculty or gift of this race, of which we have many significant indications, occurring at remote intervals, in its history. The books of Ezra and Nehemiah afford abundant evidence to this effect, that the people of the captivity had retained, in undiminished force, the national habitudes of administrative order.

The sixth chapter of Dr. Colenso's book furnishes proof—this volume being the work, not of an illiterate infidel, but of an educated clergyman—that the writer is laboring under an infatuation which blinds him to the most obvious facts; he writes in the hurried manner of one who is driven forward by an impulse he can not command. This shows itself in his citations, faulty often in the *letter*, and faulty, also, by the omission of what, in the context, would have removed his difficulty. In this chapter, for instance, he cites JOSEPHUS, Ant. iii: 12, 5. The citation itself I should confidently appeal to as an evidence (so far as *Josephus* may be listened to) of that orderliness and of that perfection in arrangement upon which I have insisted above. But now, if Dr. Colenso had looked a little way up and down on the very page whence he draws this quotation, he would have seen another passage (Cap. xii: 3) which gives us a clue to the Mosaic ceremonial law throughout. Josephus says that so much of this Ritual Institute as was practicable in the wilderness, and which could be carried out while the Tabernacle itself was sometimes fixed, sometimes in movement, was, indeed, then and there observed. But whatever therein could not *then* and *there* be carried out, was held in abeyance, awaiting the time when the people should have reached their expected rest. This is quite answer enough to the arithmetical inanities of the sixth chapter. But answers of another sort are available, also, of which I shall offer a sample or two in a note. The Rabbinical writings abound in proofs of that adaptative skill, often carried to the extreme of frivolous ingenuity, which was characteristic of the Jewish people. I spare myself the unpleasing task of following the disagreeable absurdities of page 39; nor do I think it needful here to bring

forward the Mishna to confound the Bishop. Precisely where *he* sees a "convincing proof of the unhistorical character of the whole narrative," I see a convincing proof of its authenticity, and of the genuineness of the documents in which passages of this kind occur. I may not give expression to the feeling excited by the passage beginning, "In that case the offal," etc. . . . But a word must be said which is applicable at large to those of Dr. Colenso's difficulties which bear upon the Mosaic Sacrificial Institute, as a *manipulative ceremonial*. These *misunderstandings*, which we should have regarded only as proofs of ignorance in an anonymous writer, occur in Chapters VI, XX, and XXI.

The SACRIFICIAL INSTITUTE is the very center, and it is the Reason, and it is the Final Cause of the Mosaic Dispensation. It is this which connects the ancient Dispensation with the later Covenant, of which CHRIST himself was the center. A deep-felt repugnance to this Primary Truth displays itself, either by insinuation, or in explicit affirmations, throughout the writings of those modern theologians among whom Dr. Colenso would, I presume, take his place. Can it be imagined—asks a learned writer—can it be imagined that the ALMIGHTY FATHER should enjoin, or should give instructions concerning, the slaughter of animals? Not only may it be imagined, but it may be proved as a fact, and the reality of this fact might be shown by copious and continuous evidences.

Those (and there are some such among the unlearned Laity) who have long given attention to subjects of this kind, are well aware of passages in Josephus, in Aristeas, in Philo, in the Mishna, and in later Rabbinical books, which have received unlooked-for confirmation in the course of recent explorations of the site of the Jewish Temple—I mean the substructures of the Haram. This is a large subject, and it is full fraught with meaning: here, I can but allude to it in passing. I have just above affirmed that the Jewish people were eminent in administrative ability—may I use the colloquial phrase, and call it—*cleverness in management?*—they were adroit in what is manipulative. There is now at hand unquestionable incidental evidence available to this effect. The Sacrificial Ritual, if carried out according to the Mosaic Institute, has been regarded by certain modern critics as an impracticable affair. Not so when it was in the hands of those whose vocation for life was to give effect to it. In the

structure of the temple, and in its substructures, and in its movable appointments, and in the ordering of the alternating bands of assistant ministers, and in those Oriental bodily habitudes also, which Western nations can not imitate, the *opus* of the sacrifices—daily and annual, was facilitated to a degree which we, in our stiff habits of thinking, may imagine to be impracticable.

On this grave subject I will risk the expression of a belief which I have long entertained. The Mosaic Sacrificial Institute—I mean the daily and the annual shedding of blood, in token of that one blood-shedding, by which provision is made for our redemption—was (I will profess to think so) in prospect, ages before the human period, even at that time when the mountains were lifted up from the deep, and when the hills were fashioned. There is no spot on earth that resembles, in its geological structure, this one sacrificial spot; there is no hill elsewhere to be found which is so related as this is to a deep and distant reservoir of nitric brine; there is no rising elsewhere to be found which has the same unaccounted-for and unfailing supply of water—*ὕδατος δὲ ἀνέκλειπτος ἐστι σύστασις*—and that which God had prepared when the hills were molded, man, in his time, did well and amply make available for the accomplishment of a purpose far deeper than any which the human mind could have imagined. When I now read passages which, years ago, I read with indifference, and collate these passages with the results and issues of the most recent explorations, it is with a profound feeling to this effect—that He who of old spake by Moses, has so ordered the course of events—even in these last times, as that THE PRINCIPAL TRUTH OF SCRIPTURE should receive incidental, but convincing confirmation of this peculiar sort. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews says: "And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission;" and thus, also, is it written: "Now once in the end of the world hath (CHRIST) appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." The Sacrificial Ritual which Moses, as a faithful servant, instituted in the wilderness, and which was enacted there imperfectly during the forty years' wanderings, was afterward enacted in the conquered Palestine, *so far* as might be practicable under the precarious conditions of that unsettled time. Much more fully did it come into act in a later time; and more

fully, yet with necessary modifications, in the times of the monarchy. But at length the sins of the people, and of their kings, brought this service to a pause. Nevertheless, at the very earliest moment of the return of the repentant people to their city, this shedding of the blood of victims was resumed; and so was it continued until the last day of doom, when, while the city and the temple were in flames, the priests, still faithful to their duty, fell slain beside the altar, while accomplishing the last bloody sacrifice that should ever send its fumes heavenward. But neither the Roman conqueror, with his super-imposed temple of Venus, nor the levelings of the Ælia Capitolina, nor the basilicas of Christian emperors, nor the abortive endeavors of Julian, nor the massive works of the Saracen, nor the reparations of the Crusaders, nor of the Turk, have gone deep enough to disturb those colossal memorials of the remote age of the Monarchy, when the requirements of the Sacrificial Ritual prevailed over all other requirements, in fitting the sacred site for the worship instituted by Moses. And it is now the antiquarian curiosity of travelers and residents that is bringing these long-buried memorials to light.

Upon the field of universal history there are found Insulated Facts, or alleged facts, the reality of which may be affirmed, or may be denied, without materially disturbing the surrounding historic materials. The supposed event was, perhaps, of a signal kind; but yet it was neither the direct consequence of any known train of events, nor was it a germinative event, up to which, as its cause, must be traced wide-spreading and long-enduring results. I need not here adduce instances, which the well-informed reader will promptly call to mind. But there are other events—in the nature of the case they can be but a few comparatively—which connect themselves, as causes, or as the radiating centers of political or religious influence, with large masses of the subsequent fortunes of nations. It is manifest that the office and duty of historical criticism can not be the same in dealing with these two classes of supposed facts. The insulated event, whatever may be its magnitude, may be established by proper evidences thereto relating; or it may be discharged from the page of authentic history, through the defectiveness of the evidence. "No true bill" has been found—and there is an end of the matter.

It is quite otherwise when *germinating events* are in question; for, if you reject these, or if you seriously call in question their reality, you have done only a half, or less than a half, of what it behooves you to do in such an instance. If, indeed, there was no William of Normandy, and no landing of his knights on our shores, or no Charles Martel, or no Mohammed, or no Justinian, or no Charlemagne, then, when you have reduced these imagined substances to their proper condition as shadows, you must make good the large gaps which this destructive operation has occasioned. You must bring forward a reasonable and an intelligible hypothesis, which shall fit in to so many fragmentary facts. There are a thousand facts which are ten thousand times reflected in the mirror of the past, and these now stand before us uncaused, unaccounted for; they are real, and yet they have sprung out of nothing. It is precisely *this* part of their task that has perplexed, and that now perplexes, those who reject Christianity. In his noted fifteenth and sixteenth chapters, Gibbon has immortalized his ingenuity while struggling in the fruitless endeavor to disengage Christianity from its true origin. And thus has it been in continuance to the present moment. Christianity is a vast congeries and complicity of facts; it is the causal center of numberless radiating lines; it is the spring of thousands of streams. Remove it from its place, and the entire structure of modern history crumbles into dust; a chaos is left to us as our future inheritance on the wilds of time.

After naming Christianity itself, which is the greatest of all germinating facts in the history of nations, then the next to be named in magnitude, and in the countless multiplicity of the facts and influences therewith connected, as its results and consequences, is—

THE GIVING OF THE LAW FROM SINAI.

The Promulgation of the Decalogue from the hights of Sinai, in the manner set forth in the Book of Exodus, stands before us as an instance that is better fitted than any other which might be named, as *determinative* of the question now moved within the Church, concerning the Reality of a Revelation, authenticated by supernatural attestations. On this ground I shall presume to challenge the attention of my lay brethren, and especially of

those of them who are members, and thoughtful members, of the Church of England. If the Promulgation of the Law in Ten Commandments was—as we are now told it was—nothing more than an expression of an advanced and improved divine consciousness in man, and if the alleged attendant circumstances—that is to say, the Sinaitic scene—should be regarded as a splendid fiction—innocently contrived by the inspired Moses as a proper decoration—if it be so, then the healthful reason of the Church-going Laity of England will not be slow to draw the proper inference touching our faith in Christ.

It is a circumstance highly significant as to the feeling of the author of the book on the Pentateuch, that, although he goes round about the Sinaitic scene, speaking largely of the events preceding it, and largely, also, of the events immediately subsequent thereto, he observes silence on this principal subject. Is this ominous silence to be taken as an instance of the tender regard he has to the feeble consciousness of his religious readers? This can scarcely be allowed; for, in a passage already cited, he has outraged religious feeling in a manner the most reckless; he has there uttered the puerile suggestions of an exploded rationalism in terms of his own which are little short of blasphemy. But did he not himself quail—did not his foot falter, when, in thought of this last outrage, the pen, the hand, refused to do its office?

There needs no argument to show that, if the Promulgation of the law from the hights of Sinai took place in the manner affirmed in the Mosaic books—if, indeed, then and there GOD spake these words "from out of the thick darkness," and amid the blasts of the trumpet; if it be so, then this descent of the ALMIGHTY—speaking to man, carries with it, as well the immediate antecedents of the event, as its more proximate conditions, and its next following consequences. If this history be true as to its *central fact*, it must be true, also, as to its indispensable conditions. The Sinaitic narrative must be true altogether, or it must be false altogether. But I ask a moment's attention to this narrative—as to the central fact.

The most unmarked spot on earth's alluvial levels might have been chosen as the scene of the event of which we read in the nineteenth and twentieth chapters of the Book of Exodus. But it was otherwise ordered, and a group of mountains, remarkable

beyond any other elsewhere found, was singled out as the fittest for so great an occasion. Thus, therefore, it is that the enduring continuity of local traditions which gives a sort of indestructible vitality to the names of places, whether they be important or unimportant, has clustered upon this mountain mass with a peculiar strength, as if it should never come to be doubted where it was that the Eternal, the King, Immortal, Invisible, came down to hold converse—not, as often heretofore, with favored men apart and singly, but now with a People congregated to meet HIM at HIS call. The stern sublimity of this group of precipices, its unchanging conditions, which neither man nor nature has affected in the lapse of ages, have preserved, in its primeval majesty, a scene which the modern traveler, devout or undevout, acknowledges as signally proper for the purpose when a nation was summoned to appear before God.

If an objector shall say, What you think of this geological vastness, this granitic sublimity, this adaptation of the scenery to the occasion, is the indication only of the smallness of your modes of estimating magnitudes; for what is Sinai in relation to the INFINITE—what is it in the estimation of the CREATOR of the universe? I may grant leave for this cavil; the reply is this—that, if liberty of traversing this universe were given us, so that we might behold the central palace of Omnipotence, and might gaze upon magnitudes that are immeasurable, and might see these hights of heaven blazing in the effulgence of a galaxy of suns, even then and there the same frigid reason would be equally applicable, inasmuch as things finite can bear no proportion to the attributes of the INFINITE BEING. Sinai, in its aspect as the Hebrew People saw it when it was crowned with the unquenchable fires, and such as the traveler now sees it, in its unchanging aspect of sterile majesty, is a scene proper for the purpose to which then it was made subservient.

The Arabian spearman, as if heaven had placed him there, has held watch around the hights of Sinai these thirty centuries and more; and this guard has been conservative of the Sinaitic tradition. Throughout the ages of the Saracenic history, this functionary—whether intended or involuntary—has held the memory of the one event, as if in the freshness of a recent recollection. Yet more has the Law, spoken from Sinai, lived in the constant heart and in the obduracy, too, in the better nature, in the noble

martyr strength, and also in the senile traditions, and in the daily habitudes, and in the ponderous literature, and in the speech of the people, whose ancestors then filled the wide plain at the foot of Sinai. It is the same people, immovable in mind, and now, as for ages past, a witness for God in all lands. Each Jewish heart is an enduring tablet whereupon the Sinaitic words are anew and anew written—as with the finger of God.

A fact worthy to be noted it is, but to which, in this place, I must advert only in a line, that, from the very earliest time of the rise of the Christian ascetic and *solitary* life—that is to say, the meditative life in caves and sepulchres—Sinai has been its most favored haunt; and the *conventual* life, also, has established itself upon the sides of these precipices; and within the circuit of the Sinaitic group, Christian *hermits* and Christian *societies* have dared all perils, and have endured all privations, so only that they might live and die—the guardians of the traditions of this hallowed region. Attach what value we please to this conservation—much or little—it has, in fact, availed to perpetuate an oral record of so great an occasion, with unbroken continuity, from the very times of the Exodus to the now passing moment.

It would be a fault not to note the convergence of every species of evidence upon this—the center fact of the ancient dispensation. In looking in their order to the Hebrew canonical Scriptures, and then to the apocryphal books, and then to the Rabbinical expositions, there is seen to run through the whole series that continuity of references, direct or indirect, to the Decalogue, and to the mode of its promulgation from Sinai, which ought to be looked for on the assumption of the reality, and the absolute truthfulness of the history of which that promulgation is the leading fact. No intelligent reader of the Prophets, or of the Psalmists, can need guidance in finding the passages now referred to. These passages are to be regarded as *literary evidences*, properly adducible on the hypothesis that the original record is genuine and authentic. This *literary evidence* is, however, *subsidiary* only; or it is a *secondary* body of proof; for there is a *primary* evidence. More than once in these pages, I have challenged the attention of the Laity—the Christian commonality, of which I am a member; and I do so now again in all earnestness and seriousness. *We* do not claim to be proficients in that "difficult language," a critical knowledge of which

is, we are told, a necessary qualification in any who would come to an opinion on the question—whether the Bible is of God or of man. We make no pretension to the learning or the skill requisite for detecting the gaps and splicings that intervene where twenty incoherent ancient documents were welded into the one pentateuchal and prophetic mass of our Bibles. On this ground we plead ignorance. But it is true that we have been used, from childhood upward, to listen to the Mosaic and the Prophetic books, and to the Psalms—and we have since read these books in the most serious mood. In advancing years we have read them anew—we have listened to them anew—we have pondered them anew; moreover, we have informed ourselves of the opinion of learned commentators, and in a word we have become, in our own esteem, such as may fairly pretend to form a judgment on Biblical questions—saving such as erudite proficiency may rightfully claim as its peculiar province.

Take now the case as it stands before us. The books of Holy Scripture commend themselves to our devout approval—they command our consciences, not merely nor chiefly on the ground of that superabundant literary and historic evidence which attests the genuineness and authenticity of each portion, and of the whole; but *mainly* in virtue of the irresistible force of another kind of evidence which rises into view, as if of itself: this persuasion does not come to us as the fruit of critical acumen: it is no product of lexicons; nor has it any necessary dependence upon the meaning of Hebrew works, or the significance of Hebrew idioms. We feel Holy Scripture to be—ONE BIBLE; and it proves its *Oneness* by *three distinct modes of attestation;* as thus—the Bible—or let us now speak of the Hebrew Scriptures, is *One Book*, from its first chapter to its last, because, although it is the work of many writers, it everywhere teaches ONE THEOLOGY; and we utterly refuse to believe that many writers, in series, should have done this if each followed only his own inspiration. Again, the Bible is *One Book*, although it is the work of many writers, because, amid the diversities which this human instrumentality implies, there prevails throughout it what must be reverently spoken of as the indication of the *historic personality* of the SPEAKER; everywhere this Speaker is the *same*, in mood, in purpose, *and in style*—it is the ETERNAL God that, in these books, speaks to man.

But more than this, the Bible is *One Book*, (and here we must speak of the New as well as of the Old Testament), inasmuch as it brings into view, in an occult manner, and yet undoubtedly, a One Divine Scheme, or system of justice and mercy. REVELATION, attested by supernatural events, is the opening out of an all-comprehensive course of procedure, as from God, toward the human family. Holy Scripture is *a structure*—integral and immovable as to its various constituents; and if it be disintegrated, it is destroyed. Thoughtful men, even the best minds in every age, have thus believed, and have thus recorded their most mature convictions. We need not cite the authorities which, if cited to purpose, would fill volumes. But now, even if it were granted, on the plea of legitimate criticism, that there are some loosely connected portions of the canonical mass which might be detached from it without loss or damage to the whole, or without peril to the foundations; yet it is manifest that, when criticism affects to touch, and asks leave to remove the corner-stones, or the basement masses of the building, we yield every thing when we consent to any such attempt as this.

Shall we of the Laity, strong in common sense, and not wanting in religious feeling, be brought to believe that the Decalogue may be detached from the Bible, and that, nevertheless, the Bible and our Christianity may be conserved? Or let the supposition be this, that the Ten Commandments are allowed to stand where they do, only that it shall be affirmed concerning the alleged promulgation of the same from Sinai that this—even the entire narrative is nothing but—decoration—is a human conceit—is a fiction, is a falsity, and, if a falsity, an impiety—a blasphemy. If *this* be the upshot of our modern criticism, then, be sure we shall cease from our accustomed places in Church. We will not henceforward see the Decalogue where now it is. We will not listen while these words are uttered from within the Communion rail.

The brevity of the Sinaitic Law, and its comprehensiveness, and its spirituality, and its firm theistic cautions, and its ethical effectiveness—these, its own qualities, these, its intrinsic attestations, this, its proper force for grasping and in holding the human conscience—these qualities, which are, indeed, the strength of the Law, given in ten precepts, have, from that remote age to this, commanded the conscience of men, wherever the knowl-

edge of it has come. So it has been that the most depraved of mankind have trembled in the hearing of this Law of God—and each of its prohibitions has transfixed the guilt-shaken soul; and so it has been that the most blameless of mankind have shaped their confessions upon this same mould; for in listening to this law they have wept and have humbled themselves before their Judge; yet have they rejoiced and said, "The law of thy mouth is better unto me than thousands of gold and silver." Those Ten Words, true as to their substance in all worlds, and of perpetual force, as in heaven, so toward the human family throughout all time—this Sinaitic proclamation—who is it now that shall spend upon it his nugatory criticism? Who is it that shall dare to pronounce it to be a Fable?

In every mode of incidental allusion, and of the most solemn and formal authentication, CHRIST, in the exercise of His public ministry, recognized the Decalogue, and also the summary of it, in two great commandments, as the Law of God. Look to the instances in the Gospels: read them anew, for it is quite necessary that we of the Laity should fortify our Christian belief against an assault which arms itself with the sophistries of laborious learning on the one hand, and with the sophistries of a spurious liberality on the other hand.

CHRIST, the Light of the world, and the Auther of a spiritual religion for all nations, to the end of time. CHRIST, whose word is our warrant, and it is our *only* warrant for the hope of immortality, establishes His mission, and He expressly founds His religion upon the Mosaic Revelation at large: and He does so in an emphatic manner upon the Sinaitic Decalogue. He takes this Law as the very ground of that higher and more spiritual interpretation which an *intimate* moral code demands. The several occasions on which He does this, at once *authenticating* the Mosaic Canon, and expanding its letter so as to send it in to govern the thoughts and intents of the heart, were of the most peculiar kind; as thus: "If thou wouldst inherit eternal life, keep the commandments;" namely, the commandments given from Sinai.

This is the point at which we must make our choice, and then act accordingly. The two hypotheses in front of us at this point are these; and, manifestly, they are of a kind that can admit of no loose or intermediate supposition. Either the Law in the

Ten Commandments was given by God to the Hebrew people from the hights of Sinai, in the manner narrated in the Book of Exodus; or, if not so, then this same ethical code, which had its origin, we know not where, came, in the lapse of time, to be surrounded by a mass of legendary matter—an incrustation of fable—a tissue of falsities, intended by its inventor, or its inventors, to invest it with a glare of dramatic splendor, and so, in the view of a simple people, to enhance its authority! Is this now what we mean?

But if we adopt this last hypothesis, which is the usphot of Dr. Colenso's book, as well as of the scheme propounded by the accomplished Hebraist whom he follows, then we must thus frame our conclusion, and say: CHRIST, when in a solemn manner, He rested the religion which He instituted upon the Sinaitic Law, either Himself thought of it, as the men of His time undoubtedly thought of it, who firmly believed it to have been given of God in the manner narrated by Moses—in this case He was in error and ignorance; or, if He was not in ignorance, then, in respect of a principal matter which He took as the very foundation of His religion, He practiced upon the ignorance of the Jewish people. If it be so, then how far wrong were the men who made their report to Pilate in the terms that are reported by the Evangelist?—Matt. xxvii: 63.

Every species of mystification, and all sorts of circumlocutions and ambiguities, and every imaginable evasion will be resorted to, and such are now resorted to, by those who hold with the Bishop of Natal, for the purpose of turning aside the irresistible force of this dilemma. But here I appeal to the vigorous good sense of the Laity, and ask them to free themselves from these cobwebs. The Bishop does not disguise his own consciousness of the impending inference, which he sees must be fatal to Christianity. His learned friend seeks a refuge in suppositions, the perusal of which will inflict pain upon those who esteem him. Large allowance should, however, be made in a case of this kind for the irresistible fascination of a paradox, when once it has mastered the understanding. But it is with Dr. Colenso that we have to do; and he may make his protest and say: "Although I have professed my belief that what we read in the third and the sixth chapters of Exodus is legendary and untrue, I have not *yet* affirmed the same concerning the matters contained in the

nineteenth and the twentieth chapters." If this, then, be his ground, it is certain that he owes it to himself, and to the Church, and especially to the Laity of the Church, to put forth, without delay, a profession of his belief concerning *this also*, namely, the promulgation of the Decalogue from Sinai. This profession on his part will not satisfy the reasonable demands of the Christian community, unless it is thoroughly intelligible and quite explicit.

On the supposition that Dr. Colenso admits the historic truth of the narrative in the nineteenth and twentieth chapters, then, if it be so, there is an end of the exceptions which he insists upon in the eighth, the ninth, the tenth, the eleventh, the twelfth chapters of his book. These allegations of impossibility *must*, in this case, be futile: the objector substantially disposes of the whole of his own difficulties, and he answers them himself; for when he grants the *principal fact*, namely, the gathering of the Hebrew people at the foot of Sinai, and when he yields his assent to the reality of the DIVINE PRESENCE on its summit—not mythically, but in the manner affirmed in the narrative of the event, then those other events must have had place which *this* event includes or supposes. If, indeed, it be true *in this sense* that the Almighty Father spoke to the thousands of Israel from out of the thick darkness, then these thousands must have made their way thither in some manner; they must have come on from the plains of Egypt—they, and all their herds also, must have subsisted up to that moment—they must have had shelter, and they must have been furnished with whatever was necessary to their abode in the Desert. Every kind of incongruity is heaped up around our notions of these events, if, while we admit the leading fact, we affirm the subsidiary facts to be incredible or impossible. But if this—the principal fact—be denied, then we ought, forthwith, to know in what manner a Christian Bishop reconciles this conclusion with his professed faith in Christ. This faith can not be that of the Unitarian communion; it must be the faith of the Church as expressed in the Nicene Creed.

MOSES AND COLENSO.*

BY DR. E. W. HENGSTENBERG, OF BERLIN.

To what cause, or rather causes, are the errors of Colenso to be ascribed? The first, undoubtedly, is an incorrect practical relation to the Scriptures. In his work on the question of polygamy, there is no trace of an inward subjection to the authority of the Word of God. The second cause appears to be excessive self-confidence. The ability to make an independent and thorough examination of the books of Moses he did not possess, and was, therefore, compelled to depend upon the labor of others, who held the common faith in the Word of God, and whom he recognized as invested with a sort of Divine authority. His knowledge of Hebrew was certainly very trifling. He says himself: "The study of Hebrew has, for a considerable time, been very much neglected in England." It was not till he engaged in translating the Pentateuch into the language of the Caffers, that he seems to have had much to do with Hebrew. But something more than mere philological knowledge is required for the critical treatment of the books of Moses. A considerable amount of theological culture is needed, of which we can scarcely discover the first traces in our arithmetician. There is needed, also, an intimate acquaintance, only to be obtained by many years of study, with the structure and spirit of the Pentateuch; and, still further, a critical acquaintance with the other parts of the sacred Scriptures, since one part can be correctly understood only in its connection with the whole. Of all this Colenso had nothing. From his own letters, written in the first half of the year 1861, it is clear that he was ignorant of all the literature pertaining to the subject. And yet in 1862 appeared the first volume of his work, in which he pronounces with the utmost confidence upon the critical problem! And, in the course of a single year, the work had swollen into three volumes! From such haste nothing but empty results could flow. There is not a scholar in Germany, even among those who agree with him in his conclusions, who would not say that his preparation for an independent discussion

* Translated and condensed from the *Evangelische Kirchen-Zeitung*, Jan. & Feb., 1864

of the problem was entirely insufficient. If the Bishop had remembered the warning, "know thyself," he would have escaped a great fall.

We propose to show, by a few examples, how little ground Colenso has for the confidence he expresses that his objections against the books of Moses are unanswerable.

In Ex. xxi: 20, 21, it is ordered: "If a man smite his servant or his maid with a rod, and he die under his hand, he shall be surely punished. Notwithstanding, if he continue a day or two, he shall not be punished, for he is his money." A "very intelligent Christian native," with whose help Colenso translated these words into the Zulu tongue, was amazed that God should speak of a servant or maid as mere money, and allow a terrible crime to go unpunished, because the victim had survived the brutal treatment a few hours. This gave a great shock to the Bishop's faith in the authority of the books of Moses.

We had a right to expect from the Bishop, what the Caffer might be excused for being ignorant of—some knowledge of the connection of this part of the Pentateuch with the whole, and some ability from such a higher theological plane to enlighten the native on this point. But, alas! there was nothing of the kind. The Bishop is like the native, "a very intelligent man," but his field of vision, like that of the native, does not extend beyond what is just before his eyes. He can only see a particular statement as it reads.

The Mosaic civil law is not to be regarded as an absolutely pure reflection of the character and will of God. It had respect not only to the ethical idea, but also to the people's "hardness of heart," (Matt. xix: 8), a special Old Testament malady; since, in the Old Testament, the remedy, which is so richly found in the New Testament, was not given. Whenever this malady exists under the New Covenant, it is something abnormal, an anachronism deserving of no special account; while in the Old Testament it lay, in a certain sense, in the order of things. The Old Testament civil law made the ethical idea just so far prominent as was possible in view of this hardness of heart, which, if too much had been demanded would have rejected the whole. Its mission was to raise the people from their rude condition, leaving further progress to a higher stage of revelation. The Old Testament law, therefore, had at one and the same time a permanent, and

a merely temporary character. In respect to its living spirit and its fundamental tendency, it is eternal; from this, its essential character, not one jot or tittle can ever be taken away. On the other hand, looking at the concessions which it makes to weakness, we see that it had a temporary character. It can never serve as a standard for Christian nations, of whom, because more has been given to them, more is required. In both its grand idea and its allowance for weakness, it proceeds, however, from God, who ever measures his requirements by the gifts possessed, and does not, like Pharaoh, require bricks without straw.

From this point of view it is that the Mosaic regulations in respect to slavery are to be regarded. "Moses," says J. D. Michaelis, "although allowing property in persons to remain, restricted and softened it. This is the spirit of his law. He seems to have regarded it as oppressive, and to have disapproved of this oppression." All the prescriptions of the Law of God tend to the alleviation of human bondage; none render it more severe: all breathe the spirit of love toward those in slavery, and seek to infuse this love into the minds of the people. In the law which Colenso assails, the emphasis lies, (not as the Zulu, with his narrow range of vision, supposed, and as the Bishop, standing on pretty much the same platform, so far as true theological culture is concerned, urges), upon the provision—"but if he continue a day or two days, *he shall not be punished*:" this is merely a concession, arising from "what the law could not do," made provisionally, and until better times, to the existing hardness of heart, but rather upon the command, (*v.* 20), *he shall surely be punished*. Among the Romans and other nations the terrible barbarity existed of giving to the master the power of life and death. This form of barbarism was resisted in the Mosaic law for the present, in the case that the servant died immediately. But the fundamental principle that all men bear the image of God, announced in the very introduction to the law, was thereby solemnly recognized, and thus the foundation was laid for those further developments, the germ of which was fully contained in this doctrine of the Divine image in man. Look at the whole of the prescriptions respecting bondmen recorded in the books of Moses, and you can not but be penetrated with reverence for this law, and with the earnest wish and prayer that its mild and benevolent spirit toward the unfortunate, perpetuated as it is in the New

Covenant, may pervade all hearts. Even the foreign bondmen were received through the rite of circumcision into the communion of the people of God, and participated in the Passover, the second sacrament of the Old Covenant. They were thereby placed under God's protection, and recognized as his clients. The slave was also to have his rest on the Sabbath. Whatever grew without cultivation in the Sabbatical year was to belong to the slaves and others in need. At the times of sacrifice they were to be invited to rejoice before the Lord. The mutilation of any limb or organ of the body, or any severe corporal injury whatever, secured the slave's liberty. He was to be made free, not only if an eye was destroyed, but even if a tooth was struck, (Ex. xxi: 26, 27). A slave who escaped from his foreign master might not be delivered up, but was to be allowed to dwell in Israel wherever he might choose, and was not to be oppressed, (Deut. xxiii: 16, 17). Earnest exhortations were given not to rule over an Israelitish servant with rigor. Such a servant was to serve only six years, and in the seventh became free: also in the fiftieth year, or the year of Jubilee, even if at the time he had not served six years. His master, however, was not then to send him empty out of his house, with nothing but bare freedom, but was required to give him a present of sheep, fruit, oil, and wine, with which to commence housekeeping elsewhere. Who can fail to recognize in all this the spirit of the Lord, who is good to all and merciful to all his creatures? Would that all our manufacturers and men of wealth were penetrated with this spirit! We have shown, in our article on the day-laborer, that such, alas! is not the case.

How far the Mosaic law rose above the popular sentiment—how selfishness, which always stands ready to use our fellow-men for its own ends, rebelled against it, is evident from the book of Jeremiah. Zedekiah, the last king of Judah, in order to escape the threatened judgment of the Lord, had made a covenant with all the people at Jerusalem to proclaim liberty to the servants illegally held. At first the people fulfilled their promise. "But afterward they turned, and caused the servants and the handmaids, whom they had let go free, to return, and brought them into subjection for servants and for handmaids." We see from this how the law of Moses would read if it had come from below and not from above—a law which is so penetrated with love toward

the creatures of God, that it even forbids the muzzling of the ox which treadeth out the corn.

In Lev. viii: 3, 4, Moses receives the command: "Gather thou all the congregation together unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation;" and the assembly, it is recorded, was "gathered together unto the door of the tabernacle." The unhistorical character of the Pentateuch, Colenso thinks, is here evident. The court of the tabernacle could not possibly contain the whole congregation. This is undoubtedly true. According to the calculation of Professor Riggenbach, in his treatise on "the Mosaic Tabernacle"*—which we take this opportunity to commend to our readers as an elaborate and thorough work, not one-tenth of the size of Colenso's book, but ten times more valuable—the court would contain from four to five thousand men. It is to be noticed, however, that the record in respect to the whole congregation refers to the command, and not to its actual execution. The principle recognized was, that entrance should be free to all. All, however, did not really enter. Those who could not find room remained without. It was not necessary to order this: it would regulate itself. The congregation was represented by the authorities who went in, for whom places would naturally be reserved, as is done on public occasions still. Of all this, evident to every man of ordinary observation, our arithmetician takes no account, and thus starts an objection of which he ought to be ashamed.

The fifth book of Moses begins with the words: "These are the words which Moses spoke to all Israel." No human voice, Colenso objects, could make itself heard by so great a multitude. Such objections are ridiculous. All were present: a large part, especially the elders, heard the discourse as it fell from the lips of Moses, and the others received it at second-hand.

In Ex. xxx: 11–16, it is related that the children were required to give, *at their muster*, an offering to the Lord. This offering was made, according to Chap. xxxviii: 25 seq., and the sum received was devoted to the furnishing of the sanctuary. The census itself was deferred some six months. It is surprising, Colenso thinks, that the number of the Israelites is the same at the fixing of the poll-tax in Exodus, and at the census in Numbers i: 1–46. In the course of six months, the number, he

* *Die Mosaische Stiftshütte*, Basel, 1862.

says, could not have remained unchanged. The solution, however, is this: the census, of which an account is given in Numbers, was, no doubt, accurately made; but, *in the record*, which has throughout a religious aim, and which was designed to teach the Israelites to fear the Lord their God, it is given in only a general manner, and not with the exactness which Colenso would have. This is clear from the fact that the reckoning is everywhere made by hundreds, and in the case of only one tribe by tens, with the design to make up the aggregate in Ex. xxxviii: 25. In such an account of the census, having no statistical character, but only designed to give a general view of the existing condition of the people of God, the aggregate number originally returned might be retained without difficulty, and all the more, since the difference was trifling, and since the payment of the atonement-money and the taking of the census were essentially connected together.

The "lack of accuracy," therefore, exists only when what should be viewed with the eye of a theologian is regarded with the eye of an arithmetician. For such distinctions however, Colenso has no taste, and no true idea of the nature of the books of Moses, or of the Old Testament Scriptures generally. He raises, also, the objection that the law in Ex. xxx speaks of the shekel of the sanctuary, before the sanctuary was in existence, and even if, as the Alexandrian translation has done, we substitute "sacred shekel" for "shekel of the sanctuary," it is impossible to see in what the sacred shekel could be different from the ordinary one. The answer, however, is easy. From the fact that the sanctuary did not then exist, and leaving other reasons out of the account, it is clear that we are to think, not of the shekel of the sanctuary, but only of a *sacred* shekel. The Jews have ever had a special inclination for clipping and sponging. If, against the law of God, (Deut. xxv: 15), they should cheat each other by divers weights, they were not to attempt this in this offering to their God: this shekel was, in any event, to be sacred in their eyes, because consecrated directly to Him.

It is frequently stated in the books of Moses that the Israelites, during their march through the desert, dwelt in *tents*. Thus, in Ex. xvi: 16, it is said in respect to the gathering of manna: "Take ye every man for them which are in his tents." A person cleansed from leprosy might, according to Lev. xiv: 8, return into the camp, but must tarry outside of his tent seven days.

Colenso reckons that the two millions of Israelites, allowing ten persons to each tent, would have required two hundred thousand tents. He further reckons, that, for the transportation of these tents, two hundred thousand oxen would have been necessary. Whence were so many tents to be obtained? How could the barren wilderness furnish food for so many oxen?

This is the difficulty: we now give the solution. Whenever the Israelites are spoken of as dwelling in tents, the more prominent portions of them are meant; just as when the Psalmist says, "Peace be within thy walls and prosperity within thy *palaces*," he does not mean that all the dwellings in Jerusalem were palaces. Such an inference would be absurd. In the very books of Moses which speak of tents, we find distinct evidence that a large part of the Israelites dwelt in *booths*, which could be made of any material, even, if necessary, of earth. The name of the first station of the Israelites, Succoth, in Hebrew means booths. It was probably given in imitation of their ancestor Jacob, of whom it is related in Gen. xxxiii: 17: "And Jacob journeyed to Succoth, and built him a house, and made *booths* for his cattle: therefore the name of the place is called Succoth." More decisive still is the direction to the Israelites in observing the festival commemorative of the gracious guidance by Jehovah through the wilderness, not to dwell in tents, but in booths, which indicates distinctly that such was the manner of life of the larger number on their journeyings. The command runs, (Lev. xxiii: 42, 43), "Ye shall dwell in *booths* seven days; . . . . . that your generations may know that I made the children of Israel to dwell in *booths*, when I brought them out of the land of Egypt." Booths, made of every variety of material, are still used, along with tents, on the peninsula of Sinai. Says Faber in his Hebrew Archæology: "The Bedouins of the present day change their dwellings. In winter they live in tents, and in summer they build huts. The Turcomans do the same." Burkhardt relates: "We halted on a plain at a spot where a few bushes grew, among which we found a Bedouin woman and her daughter, who were living under a shelter made of rushes and brush-wood." Not only in the books of Moses, but also in Hos. xii: 9, the word tent is used in a broader sense, to include booths also. The Lord in that passage threatens the degenerate people: "I will yet make thee to dwell in tabernacles (tents) as in the days of the feast." In

the days of the feast the children of Israel dwelt not in tents, but in booths. By the word tents the prophet means any and all temporary dwellings, in contrast with the fixed and convenient residences, in which the children of Israel had forgotten the Lord, who had been so gracious to them. A large part of the Israelites, however, on the march through the desert, it is certain, had not even booths. "The traveler," says Robinson, "can, if he pleases, get along very well without bed or tent." The difficulty in respect to the weight of the tents actually possessed amounts to nothing. They were for the most part a mere piece of cloth, made by the women, and attached to a single pole.

Let us now leave the tents and turn to another of Colenso's objections. According to Ex. xiii: 18, the children of Israel went up *armed* (English version, "harnessed:" Marg., "by five in a rank"), out of Egypt, and it is impossible that Pharaoh should have allowed to six hundred thousand men the use of weapons of war. The phrase here in question is one the exact meaning of which interpreters have not been able, thus far, to settle; but that it can not have the signification which Colenso gives it, all are now agreed. *Ewald*, for example, explains it: "They went up, divided into five divisons, i. e. according to the most ancient and simple arrangement of an army, into the front and rear ranks, the center, and the right and left wings." *Knobel:* "Marshaled, organized in divisions and regular battalions, as distinguished from a disorderly and confused crowd." *Keil:* "Not exactly armed, but equipped for the march; not in a disorderly way like fugitives." What a pitch of audacity does it exhibit, first arbitrarily to assign a meaning to the passage, and then, with this meaning, to commence operations at once in criticism! The children of Israel went up out of Egypt, *marshaled* in warlike array, but that they were *armed* is inconsistent with the whole account of the state of the Israelites in Egypt before the Exodus, as given in the books of Moses, with the helpless condition of the children of Israel when pursued by the armed Egyptians, and with the words of Moses, "The Lord shall fight for you, and ye shall hold your peace."

"In one single day," continues Colenso, "the whole immense population of Israel, as large as that of London, was instructed to keep the Passover, and actually did keep it. I have said, in one single day; for the first notice of any such feast to be kept

is given in this very chapter, (xii), where we find it written, (*v.* 12), 'I will pass through the land of Egypt *this night*, and will smite all the first-born in the land of Egypt, both man and beast.' It was impossible, he urges, that in one day or rather twelve hours, the notice should be conveyed to all the widely-scattered households, the equipments be completed, and the feast be held."

The fundamental error here lies in assuming that the command to keep the Passover was first given to the children of Israel on the fourteenth day of the month. The moment this is set aside, the objection disappears, and also the position that the Israelites had not sufficient time to solicit gifts from the Egyptians. The command to keep the Passover was issued, according to Ex. xii: 1, at the beginning of the first month, on the fourteenth day of which the feast was to be observed, leaving ample time before the tenth day, on which a lamb was to be taken for every house. The whole programme of the festival was then made known. "In this night," (in *v.* 12), refers to the fourteenth day of the month, (*v.* 6), when the lamb was to be slain, like "in that night," (*v.* 8), "this day," (*v.* 14), and "this self-same day," (in *v.* 17). The danger of beginning to criticise before interpretation has done its work is here very apparent. Blunderers in exegesis, with their over-hasty attacks upon the Scriptures, have only themselves to blame. At the very beginning of the month the command was given to Moses. He at once summoned the elders and said to them, according to *v.* 21: "Take [on the 10th of the month] for every family a lamb, and kill [on the 14th, to be supplied from the command given by Moses] the Passover." "And the children of Israel," it is said in *v.* 28, "did as the Lord had commanded Moses and Aaron." Every thing is here in order, and the difficulty exists only so long as careful attention to the narrative is neglected. When it is said, in *v.* 29, "and it came to pass at midnight," the preceding context shows that the midnight of the fourteenth day, just specified, is to be understood.

In Ex. xii: 37, 38, it is recorded: "And the children of Israel journeyed from Rameses to Succoth, about six hundred thousand on foot that were men, besides children. And a mixed multitude went up also with them; and flocks, and herds, even very much cattle." Such a multitude of men, Colenso supposes, are related to have set out on their march immediately on receiving the

command. How could the order be communicated so instantly over a large extent of country? How could they all assemble so soon at Rameses?

This difficulty is disposed of, in the main, by the explanation just given. For some considerable time it had been decided that the children of Israel were soon to depart: for fourteen days, in Rameses, the residence of Moses and Aaron, and throughout the land of Goshen, every thing was in readiness. In such an excited condition of the people, the directions of Moses would be rapidly communicated. The march began from Rameses. On the way additions were received from every side. Every thing was entirely ready for the journey—loins girded, the staff in hand, the shoes on the feet.

It was impossible, Colenso further objects, to support the numerous herds of the Israelites forty years in the dry and barren deserts. There could not have been less than two million sheep and oxen.

We answer: Although the Israelites undoubtedly took numerous herds with them out of Egypt, it is nowhere said that they brought their herds even as far as Sinai. On the contrary, we see from Ex. xvi: 2, (comp. *v.* 12), that they bitterly complained of the want of animal food, and, consequently, could not have had any considerable herds. The larger part had long before either been slaughtered, or had died of thirst, (Ex. xvii: 3). At Sinai, it is true, we find the Israelites in possession of herds, since in Ex. xxxiv: 3, Moses directs that neither the flocks nor herds shall feed near the mount; but here, where sufficient pasturage existed, the Israelites could have purchased these herds from the inhabitants. That the account of the celebration of the Passover on Sinai can furnish no measure for estimating *the extent* of these herds will be shown further on. There is no evidence that after the departure of the Israelites from Sinai, and during the whole time of their residence in the desert, they permanently owned any considerable number of herds. All that can be shown from the request of the Israelites, in the fortieth year of their wandering, to pass through the land of Edom with their *herds* is, that they still possessed the most necessary beasts of burden, (comp. Num. vii: 3). It is evident from Num. xi: 22, that the people had no means of obtaining animal food. "Shall flocks and herds be slain for them, and it will suffice them?"

He means, says *Knobel*, that if even all the cattle should be slaughtered, not the whole of the people, but only a few of them, would receive any thing. The passage, however, on which Colenso principally rests to prove that, according to the books of Moses, a considerable number of herds were kept during the entire march through the wilderness, is Num. xxxii: 1: "Now the children of Reuben, and the children of Gad, had a very great multitude of cattle: and they saw the land of Jaazer, and the land of Gilead, and lo! the place was a place for cattle." Here he assumes, entirely against evidence, that these herds were those originally possessed by the two tribes. On the contrary, they had been recently acquired. Reuben and Gad had not only had their share of the immense number of cattle, which, according to the preceding chapter, had been taken from the Midianites, but had also obtained many cattle at the conquest of the land of Sihon, King of the Amorites, in which they had probably borne a prominent part. Their own special service, it is true, they do not mention in *v.* 4, but without some such reason their request would have had no reason to support it, nor would Moses have been likely to grant it.

In considering the possibility of support for men and cattle in the wilderness, it must not be overlooked that the peninsula of Sinai was anciently more productive than it is at present. Ritter, the most eminent geographer of the present century, to whom Colenso may well show some deference, says, in respect to this question:* "The acacia, although thorny and giving but little shade, is a tree of the greatest importance; its foliage supplies the camels with their favorite and most nourishing food; its groves furnish attractive spots for encampments; it yields the best and, in fact, the only timber, as well as the best coal. But since no pains are ever taken to plant this tree, it is evident that it may have become less abundant than formerly, and this decrease, in turn, have contributed not a little to the drying up of the surface of the peninsula. Rüppel, on retracing his steps from Arla to Sinai, found, in a lonely and unvisited spot, trees of the greatest beauty, with larger trunks than are ever seen in the other deserts of the peninsula, and was satisfied that, in all probability, those valleys were once well wooded." In another place† Ritter says:

* *Erdkunde*, Th. xiv. S. 341. † S. 926.

"We have already repeatedly spoken of the physical condition of the country in ancient times, in consequence of which it must have been essentially different from what it is at present. Hence the former affluence of vegetation, especially in trees, both larger and more numerous, *with the disappearance of which the number of smaller products of the vegetable kingdom necessarily diminished;* hence the greater abundance of various esculents of which the people of Israel could make use: so, too, the more general and thorough cultivation of the land, exhibited in the mining operations and settlements of the ancient Egyptians in the monumental period, as well as the widely-scattered remains of cloisters, hermitages, walls, gardens, and fountains belonging to Christian antiquity; and, finally, the possibility of a better employment of the occasional supply of water in the Wadys, from the rains and the not at all unfrequent showers, which may have been carefully preserved, by artificial means, as is done in other regions in the same latitude, for times of need. These facts, supported and confirmed as they are by the numerous inscriptions at Sinai and Serbal, with those in the Wady Mokatteb and in a hundred other valleys throughout the whole central group of mountains, show that a numerous population once existed here. It must also be remembered that, before the passage of the Israelites, four different peoples, the Amalekites, Midianites, and Ishmaelites, and, on the East, the Edomites actually dwelt in this region. We perfectly agree, therefore, with the critical historian in his remark, that the peninsula was able to sustain a far larger number of men at that time than it can at present, although under great privations indeed, which were often spoken of in the recollections of the people, but which never imperiled their means of subsistence. From the smallness of the present shiftless population, no inference can be formed with certainty in respect to an earlier state of things, any more than in the case of many regions once highly cultivated—Sogdiana, for instance—which, in consequence of human indolence, have become barren." So far the most eminent geographer of the present century. Before such an authority, should not Colenso be ashamed of the confidence with which he pronounces his superficial opinions?

In considering the means of support possessed by the Israelites in the desert, it must also be particularly borne in mind that this industrious people had reached a high degree of pros-

perity in Egypt, and possessed a considerable amount of the precious metals. The assurance was given to Abraham, (Gen. xv: 14), "And afterward shall they come out with great substance;" and in Deut. ii: 6, 7, Moses says to the people: "Ye shall buy meat of them for money, that ye may eat: and ye shall also buy water of them for money, that ye may drink. *For the Lord thy God hath blessed thee in all the works of thy hand*," so that thou hast gold enough to supply all thy necessities. Wherever gold abounds, commercial relations are soon established. The desert lay between the fertile countries, Egypt and Canaan, between which, as the history of Joseph shows, caravans passed as early as the times of the patriarchs. From Edom, also, on the borders of which the Israelites for thirty-eight years had their principal camp, they received supplies. Many of them, also, under the influence of the commercial spirit, of the existence of which, in the early history of the nation, Gen. xlix: 13 and Deut. xxxiii give evidence, were certainly dispersed in the neighboring countries, in quest of gain and new means of subsistence. It is only necessary to bear constantly in mind that we possess no proper history of the people at this period. The books of Moses are a religious book, in the fullest sense of the term. Accordingly, they relate the extraordinary provision of manna which God made for his people in time of need, but give no account of their ordinary means of support.

The next objection of Colenso—viz., that the number of the Israelites, as given in the books of Moses, is suspicious when compared with the extent of the land of Canaan; and that two millions of people, (not far from which the whole number must have been, if there were six hundred thousand men), could not have had room enough along side of the aboriginal inhabitants—has been sufficiently refuted by others, especially by Professor Von Raumer in his excellent geography of Palestine. When, according to Sam. xxiv, the census ordered by David was made by Joab, there were found to be, leaving the tribe of Benjamin out of the account, in Israel eight hundred thousand, and in Judah five hundred thousand men. This would give a population of about five millions. In Colenso's comparison with the population of England, one important element is entirely left out. In the hot climate of the East, not more than one-third perhaps as much food is needed for the support of a man as is required in the

colder regions of the West; and yet nine counties in England, in the aggregate, give an average of from twelve to thirteen thousand to the square mile,* while two million Israelites, distributed over the five hundred square miles of Palestine, would give only about four thousand to the square mile. If we assume that there were then two million Canaanites in the country, we should have only eight thousand inhabitants to a square mile, (or more than twenty English square miles). The fertility of the land was very great. Ritter, in his geography, referring to the abundance of water in ancient Palestine, arising from the mountainous formation of the country, says, "It was entirely superior in this respect to the neighboring countries, Arabia, Babylonia, and Egypt, which were ten times larger," and thus, without designing it, gives an excellent commentary upon the words of Moses in Deut. xi: 10, 11: "The land whither thou goest in to possess it, is not as the land of Egypt, from whence ye came out, where thou sowedst thy seed, and wateredst it with thy foot, as a garden of herbs: but the land is a land of hills and valleys, and drinketh water of the rain of heaven." Ritter refers also to the "Canaanite terraces," by means of which the mountains which are at present barren were made productive to their summits, with which agrees the representation of Isaiah, (vii: 25), who speaks of the hills which were digged with the mattock, and which, in the time of visitation, should be covered with thorns and thistles. Whoever, therefore, regards as exaggerated the account of the books of Moses, in respect to the number of the Israelites, becomes incapable of explaining the historical facts. Such a number was requisite in order to gain possession of a country peopled with warlike inhabitants, and defended by fortified cities. From all indications, and especially the numerous cities mentioned in the book of Joshua, the Canaanite population must have amounted to several millions.

The unhistorical character of the books of Moses is further clear, according to Colenso, from the statement in Num. iii: 43, that the number of the first-born was 22,273, which is much too small in proportion to the entire number of adults. Such a proportion he maintains is wholly unexampled. His mistake lies in counting *all* the first-born, including those who were fathers and

* A German geographical mile is a little more than four and a half English miles.

grandfathers, whereas Moses speaks only of the first-born among the *children* up to a certain age. This limitation is required in the first place by the reference to the great event in Egypt. The consecration of the first-born to the service of the Lord, who were exempted, as it were, by the substitution of the Levites, rested upon the fact that, at the death of the first-born in Egypt, they were spared. God declared, says Calvin, that by preserving their lives by his grace, he had made them his own. Now, the plague in Egypt did not fall upon the first-born universally, but upon the first-born among the children. To Pharaoh, who himself was the first-born—for otherwise he would not have sat upon the throne—the message was sent, (Ex. iv: 23): "I will slay thy *son*, even thy first-born;" and, according to Ex. xii: 29, the Lord smote "all the first-born in the land of Egypt, from the first-born of Pharaoh that sat on his throne, unto the first-born of the captive that was in the dungeon, and all the first-born of cattle." Neither of Pharaoh, the highest, nor of the prisoner, the lowest, nor of any between them, was there any question whether they themselves were the first-born of their families: it was only their little sons to whom the threat applied. This gives the proper limitation to the apparently unqualified expression in Num. iii: 43. None could have been meant except such of the first-born as belonged to the same class, in respect to age, with the children destroyed in Egypt. To the same result we are brought also by the phrase in Num. iii: 12, "All the first-born that openeth the womb," (comp. Ex. xiii: 2–12), which applies only to those in respect to whom the thought of their parentage is the first to present itself, viz., to young children, and not to fathers and grandfathers. Again, when it is said, (Ex. xiii: 2): "Sanctify unto me all the first-born, whatsoever openeth the womb," the command refers simply to those who were unconditionally under the direction of their parents, who were incapable of directing themselves, like the child Samuel when consecrated by his mother to the service of the Lord, as is evident from Ex. xiii: 13, "All the first-born of man *among thy children* shalt thou redeem." To what strange investigations would any other principle have led! In confining it to children, the line was so run that, in the main, the number agreed with the number of the Levites. This might the more easily take place, since the substitution of the Levites was symbolical rather

than strictly literal, having for its object to impress upon the minds of the people their obligation to exercise the deepest gratitude to the Lord for the gracious deliverance they had experienced, and of which every Levite was a standing monument. The omission to mention any definite age, occasioned by the absence of any precise fixing of the age, with a certain reference to the number of the Levites, has given rise to the appearance of including *all* the first-born in the command, and Colenso in his constant judging according to appearances, and in his eagerness to admit any thing which suits his purpose, has thus been deceived.

Colenso attaches very great importance to the objection that the increase of the Israelites during their sojourn in Egypt from seventy souls to six hundred thousand armed men was impossible. To the support of this he devotes five entire chapters.

Now, in the first place, the length of the sojourn in Egypt is here improperly shortened. He limits it to two hundred and fifteen years, while in reality it continued four hundred and thirty years. On this point we have, in the books of Moses, two classical passages. The first (Gen. xv: 13–16) is prophetic, and gives the whole period in round numbers, as four hundred years: "And he said unto Abram, Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years; and also that nation, whom they shall serve, will I judge: and afterward shall they come out with great substance. And thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age. But in the fourth generation they shall come hither again." There can be no question that four hundred years is here assigned to the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt alone. The passage speaks of their sojourning in only one land, among only one people, and the description of the land as not their own is in contrast with Canaan, which was promised to them from the beginning; and of which Abraham was already the ideal possessor, (Gen. xiii: 3). The four *generations* must, therefore, be reckoned as four hundred years, with which the greater length of life at that time, a hundred years to a generation, very well agrees. The second passage is purely historical and chronological. It is one of the links in the chain of chronological data in the books of Moses, which give the entire period from the creation of the

world to the end of the fortieth year of the march through the wilderness, and which, notwithstanding the fragmentary and apparently disjointed style of the narration, constitute a connected whole in which no gap nor contradiction ever occurs—a harmony which proves that in the Pentateuch we have a work proceeding from a single hand and planned as a whole. It is stated in Ex. xii: 40, 41: "Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was four hundred and thirty years. And it came to pass at the end of the four hundred and thirty years, that all the hosts of the Lord went out from the land of Egypt." The same period which was prophetically given as four hundred years, is here in chronological exactness given as four hundred and thirty years. The words are explicit. The Alexandrian translators and the Samaritan text, after the clause, "in the land of Egypt," supply "and in the land of Canaan." But the passage itself furnishes not the least support for any such change. It was arbitrarily made to avoid certain difficulties which seemed to stand in the way of supposing that the sojourn of the children of Israel in Egypt continued so long. It was natural, however, that on their departure from Egypt, the length of their residence there should be mentioned. The length of the residence of the Patriarchs in Canaan had been already stated. The chronological data of the books of Moses are every-where linked together like a chain, and never overlap each other, as would here be done if the length of the sojourn of the Patriarchs in Palestine were included in the reckoning. If there were any doubt in the case, it would be removed by referring to the prophetical passage already cited. To the four hundred years of prophecy the more definite number of four hundred and thirty here corresponds.

To this it has been replied that in the genealogy of Moses and Aaron in Ex. vi: 6, 16 seq., only four generations are given from Levi to Moses. But this is of no importance, since it is the manner of the Scriptures, which every-where study the utmost brevity, and throw overboard all useless ballast, to abbreviate long genealogies (so in the New Testament, the genealogy of Christ in Matthew) in order, by omitting unimportant links, to help the memory. To such a degree is this the rule that we might here expect omissions in advance. The objection of Colenso, therefore, that they really exist, are of no weight. When he says that the recorded age of Levi, Kohath, and Amram

renders it impossible to extend the sojourn in Egypt to four hundred and thirty years, he overlooks the important circumstance that it is not stated in what year each begat his first-born, as is every-where mentioned in the books of Moses whenever the design is to connect the genealogical record in a continuous line. The mention of the respective ages of these prominent persons was a matter purely biographical, and no chronological calculations can be made to rest upon it. To the next objection of Colenso, How does it happen that several other genealogies contain the same number of names? it may be replied that the reason is probably to be found in the prophecy of four hundred years; each name represented a hundred years. The objection, finally, that "it is expressly stated that Amram (the father of Moses) took him to wife Jochebed, the daughter of Levi, who was born to him in Egypt," (Num. xxvi: 59, comp. Ex. ii: 1), can impose only upon those who know but little of the genealogical mode of speaking in the Old Testament. Amram, the head of one of the families of Kohathites, which, in the time of Moses, consisted of thousands of members, (Num. iii: 27, 28), took Jochebed to wife, not in his own person, but in one of his descendants, with whose name we are not acquainted; and she herself was not strictly a daughter of Levi, but was only one of his descendants—one of the tribe of Levi, who traced her ancestry back to him in Egypt. She was born in Egypt in the same sense in which Mordecai (in his ancestors) was carried away from Jerusalem, (Esth. ii: 6), and in which Rahab still dwelt, after the lapse of centuries, in Judah, (Josh. vi: 25). The genealogies of the Old Testament have a language peculiar to themselves, and those who, like Colenso, have no acquaintance with it, should not venture into this department.

It is, then, an established fact, that the sojourn of the children of Israel in Egypt continued not two hundred and fifteen, but four hundred and thirty years.* This is not the whole, however,

*In Gal. iii: 17, Paul mentions four hundred and thirty years as the whole period between the covenant with Abraham and the giving of the law. Dr. Hengstenberg would probably explain this apparent discrepancy by saying, with Wieseler, (Galaterbrief), that the apostle, in writing to those who used the Septuagint, employed the traditional chronology of that translation, just as he generally quoted from it in citing passages from the Old Testament, which he could do all the more readily, since in the connection nothing depended upon chronological exactness. D.

which we have to reply to Colenso. A further error is his view that the whole of the people of Israel were derived from the twelve sons of Jacob. The descendants of these, it is true, constituted the bulk of the nation, but the posterity of the servants who went down into Egypt with Jacob formed a very important addition.

At the original institution of the rite of circumcision, it was ordered that all servants should be circumcised, and thus be received into the communion of the chosen people, (Gen. xvii: 12, 13). Abraham alone led forth three hundred and eighteen house-born servants to war. His entire camp, therefore, must certainly have consisted of several thousand souls. Jacob had already increased to two bands when he returned from the country on the other side of the Euphrates. Whole files of servants he sends, according to Gen. xxxii, to meet Esau. Two sons of Jacob, according to Gen. xxxix, fall upon a city, slay the male inhabitants with the sword, plunder it, and carry away all their goods, together with their wives and children. This they could not have done unless they had been supported by a multitude of servants, whose aid was all the more necessary since the other sons of Jacob took no part in the transaction. "The sons of Jacob," in *v.* 27, are those previously mentioned. That only Simeon and Levi were engaged is further evident from the heavy retribution which the dying Jacob announces as about to befall them, as distinguished from the others, (xlix: 5–7). After Isaac's death, the camp of Jacob was undoubtedly largely increased. He went down into Egypt with cattle, small and great, and all his goods, (Gen. xlv: 10). With the cattle the *servants* are every-where mentioned. In Gen. xxvi: 14, the phrase "and many servants" corresponds to "and all that was his" in the passage before us. In Gen. xlvi: 10, it is said: "And they took their cattle and their goods which they gat in the land of Canaan." To those belonged also the souls which they gat, which, in Gen. xii: 5, are made specially prominent as a principal part of the goods. Besides, Pharaoh appropriated to Joseph an entire province of considerable extent. This shows very clearly that the emigrants were not a mere family, but a small nation. In view of the clear and positive proof that the descendants of Jacob were only the center of a large population, the objection of Colenso, that serv-

ants are not mentioned as accompanying the sons of Jacob on their journey to Egypt to buy corn, loses all its force.

We are to reckon, however, along with the seventy souls descended from Jacob, not only the numerous servants which he brought into Egypt, but also the further additions made in Egypt. On the departure of the children of Israel, we find in their company a great multitude of Egyptians, (Ex. xii: 38, Num. xi: 14). The stringent caste system of Egypt must have led many who were oppressed by it to desire to change their lot. Even before this, it was impossible for the children of Israel to reject those who came to them. The direction given to Abraham, to receive the bondmen through circumcision into the community, showed to them that they were not to restrict their nationality within such narrow limits as the other nations of antiquity did. One great idea—that of communion with the true God—constituted, from the beginning, the soul of the nation's life. Whoever heartily accepted this idea, which made national descent an entirely subordinate matter, could not be denied the privilege of membership in this community. He was naturalized and enrolled as one of the people, and this was typical of the future reception of the Gentiles among the people of God, to which reference was made in the call of Abraham: "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." That the people of God increased in this way in Egypt, is quite clear. From the command of Moses in Deut. xxiii: 8, 9, that in future no obstacle should be allowed to prevent the reception of the Egyptians into the congregation, it is evident that when the lines were less sharply drawn and the distinctive character of the people of God was less clearly defined, such additions must have been common. The passage in 1 Chron, ii: 34, 35, is entirely decisive: "Now Sheshan had no sons, but [only] daughters. And Sheshan had a servant, an Egyptian, whose name was Jarha. And Sheshan gave his daughter to Jarha his servant to wife; and she bare him Attai." The posterity of this Egyptian servant Jarha is then recorded in thirteen generations among the descendants of Judah.

No one, it is believed, will deny that, with these observations, the objection to the credibility of the books of Moses, derived from the great number of the Israelites who went up out of Egypt, is radically refuted.

An insurmountable obstacle to the reception of these books,

however, according to Colenso, is the small number of the priests, compared with the extent of their duties and the greatness of their income. His error here lies in assuming the number of the priests to have been only three; misunderstanding, as it appears, Num. iii: 4: "And Nadab and Abihu died before the Lord, in the wilderness of Sinai, and they had no children: and Eleazar and Ithamar ministered in the priest's office in the sight of Aaron their father." But Eleazar and Ithamar are not to be considered in this passage as single individuals, but rather as the centers of a considerable number of sons and grandsons. In contrast with Nadab and Abihu, who died *without sons*, are mentioned Eleazar and Ithamar, *with their sons*. Aaron, at the departure from Egypt, was eighty-three years old; he died in the fortieth year of the march, at the age of one hundred and twenty-three years. It is worthy of notice that the age at which the priests were to enter upon their work is not given in the law, although it is fixed in respect to the Levites. The reason may perhaps be, that it was necessary at that time to bring forward the priests while quite young, because their number was not yet sufficiently large. From Ex. vi: 25 it can not be inferred that Phineas was the only son of Eleazar. He is there specially mentioned among the numerous sons of Eleazar only on account of his special prominence subsequently. That there was, even then, a whole multitude of priests may be inferred from the prescriptions in respect to their duties and their income. This conclusion is confirmed by the fact that, as early as the time of Joshua, thirteen cities were set aside for the priests, (Josh. xxi: 19). Even if provision was thereby made for the future increase of the priesthood, or if these cities were not exclusively occupied by the priests, still the assignment, in any case, certainly presupposes the existence of a large number of this class. Besides, it must not be overlooked that at first much might have been done by the Levites, as assistants to the priests, which, at a later period, was performed by the priests alone. The Levites are placed, in Num. iii: 9, unconditionally under the direction of Aaron and his sons. "A stranger" is simply one who ministered without the authority of the priests, as the sons of Korah presumed to do. That a large sphere was originally occupied by the Levites, and that they were intrusted with many things which properly belonged to the priests, may be inferred from the history of the Levite employed by

Micah to serve as a private priest, not long after the death of Joshua, (Jud. xvii,) and who afterward became a "father and priest" in the Danite colony, (chaps. xviii, xix).

Colenso insists that at the second Passover, which was kept in the wilderness of Sinai, (Num. ix: 5), the priests could not have been sufficiently numerous to sprinkle upon the altar the blood of one hundred and fifty thousand lambs, the number probably required for two million men. But this position rests upon exceedingly weak grounds. We know very little respecting the second Passover. The account of Moses is quite brief and summary. It would have been wholly omitted, but for the regulation made at that time, and which was to be perpetually binding, in respect to the substitute Passover for the unclean. That there was no other reason for recording it is clear, from the fact that this second Passover is not mentioned till the writer, in his chronological narrative, comes to the *second* month, in which the regulation respecting the substitute Passover was first carried out. Had the second Passover been to him a matter of independent interest, he would inevitably have given an account of it in the history of the first month. We do not know whether the priests, so early as this, officiated at the Passover. The command, in Deut. xvi, that after the occupation of the land of Canaan the Passover should be observed at the sanctuary, appears to show that previously the celebration was a domestic one, and that the observance of the second Passover was conducted like that of the first, as the express directions respecting it also show. We have not the slightest knowledge of the number of lambs offered at the second Passover. At a later period there was no fixed rule. According to Josephus, not less than ten men participated in the paschal meal: "In many instances, however," he says, "they amounted to twenty." In Ex. vii, the number is not prescribed. According to *v.* 4, several families might unite. The number was decided according to circumstances. The satisfying of hunger was not essential. If there was a deficiency of lambs, the feast might be conducted as the Lord's Supper is with us, so that hundreds or more might partake of a single lamb. Colenso in his calculations should have remembered the principle: "If there be first a willing mind, it is accepted according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not." So, for example, when he reckons that the two doves, required by the law after

the birth of each child, would amount annually to about ninety thousand, and asks, How could so many doves be obtained in the wilderness? That all such regulations were modified by the actual ability of persons to comply with them is evident from Lev. v, in which it is provided that if an offender was unable to offer the lamb or kid required for a trespass-offering, he might bring two doves, and if even these exceeded his ability, he might offer a little fine flour.

A second special difficulty connected, according to Colenso, with the small number of the priests is, that according to Deut. iv: 11, 12, if the high-priest should sin, he was to take the skin of the bullock, which he offered as a sin-offering, together with the flesh and refuse, to a clean place without the camp, where the ashes were deposited, and there burn it. This heavy burden, Colenso supposes, "would have had to be carried by the priest himself (Aaron, Eleazar, or Ithamar—there were no others) a distance of three-quarters of a mile." This difficulty, also, is purely one of his own making, even aside from the fact that the priesthood was much more numerous, and that the Levites were placed under the control of the priests for just such service. Colenso erroneously supposes that the case here referred to was of frequent occurrence. What is spoken of is not ordinary sins, like those which the Psalmist had in mind when he said, "Who can understand his errors?" but those like Aaron's when he consented to the worship of Jehovah under the symbol of a golden calf. On the words, "If he sin according to the sin of the people," *Knobel* remarks: "The sin referred to can only be that which he commits in his office as head of the people, to the exclusion of lesser private sins." Such an offense of the high-priest, in all probability, never occurred, except in that one case, during the whole march through the wilderness. Moses provides for its possible occurrence only in order to keep the high-priest humble and to teach him to walk with fear and trembling, by bringing before his mind that he, too, is a poor sinner, and, at every step, must watch against sin, which, in his case, would meet with a heavier condemnation than in that of the members of the congregation. We meet with several other laws, also, which have been scarcely ever executed, and were never designed for that purpose, but were intended only to clothe some doctrine or exhortation in a legal form. So, for example, the law, accord-

ing to which the parents of an intractable son were to bring him before the authorities, and they were to put him to death.

The extent of the camp, also, according to Colenso, is utterly inconsistent with the provisions of the Mosaic law, and proves them to have been incapable of execution, and to have no historical foundation. "They could not, surely," he says, "all have gone outside the camp for the necessities of nature, as commanded in Deut. xxiii: 12–14." He reckons that the twenty-two thousand Levites stationed in the center of the camp around the tabernacle would have had, shovel in hand, a journey every day of six English miles. This, he thinks, involves an "absurdity." But the absurdity rests, on closer examination, not upon Moses, but upon the Bishop of Natal. What is spoken of in Deut. xxiii: 12–14, is the sanitary condition of the camp in times of war, as is expressily mentioned in *v.* 9. The direction relates not to what was to be done at that time, but in the future, when the people should be in possession of the land, and should be obliged to send a large army against foreign enemies. This is in accordance with the entire tendency of the fifth book of Moses, which supplements the earlier legislation by directions which apply to the residence of the children of Israel in the land they were about to enter. "On the march through the wildernes," observes Dr. Keil, in his commentary on the books of Moses,* for which we wish a wide circulation among our theological readers, "only those who were affected with uncleanness of long standing were to be removed from the camp, (Num. v: 12), while in military encampments, on the other hand, these regulations were to be in force in respect to lesser forms of uncleanness." From the fact that the direction in question was given only for the future, we infer that, in the existing relations, its enforcement was impracticable and could not have been contemplated.

The last of Colenso's assaults, in his first volume, against the credibility of the books of Moses, relates to the account of the march against Midian in Num. xxxi. Twelve thousand Israelites slew all the males of the Midianites without the loss of a single man. But, on closer examination, this appears to be no more improbable than the account of Tacitus, that, in a fortress taken by the Romans, all the adult males were slain without the

* Announced for translation in Clarke's Foreign Library. D.

loss of a man. The Israelites had not to deal with all the Midianites, but only with a single branch of the tribe which dwelt on the east of Canaan. These Midianites were not a specially warlike people. According to Gen. xxxvi: 35, they had been already conquered by the fourth King of the Edomites. According to Josh. xiii: 21, Sihon, King of the Amorites, had made them tributary. Their princes, as vassals of this king, had undoubtedly taken part in the battle in which he was defeated by the children of Israel, (Num. xxi). That was the real struggle with them: what is here related was not so much a battle as an execution. How little the Midianites were inclined or were in a condition to fight, is shown by the wiles and tricks to which, in their weakness, they resorted, first in calling in Balaam with the Moabites, and then in devising their plan of seduction. It is remarkable that, in the full enumeration of the booty taken by the Israelites, no mention is made of camels, although the camels of Midian were proverbial, (Is. lx: 6), and in the expedition of Midian against Israel, in Jud. vi: 15; vii: 12, in the time of the Judges, we find camels without number. We infer from this, that the fighting men, so far as they had not fallen in the battle against Sihon, had sought safety in flight upon their camels, just as in the surprise of the Amalekites by David two hundred young men threw themselves upon their camels and escaped, (1 Sam. xxx: 17). In such circumstances a bloodless victory, a victory without a struggle, is altogether probable. The account is not the history of a battle.

In these few pages we have torn in pieces, without much difficulty, the whole of Colenso's first volume. No one will expect us to follow him through the other still more insignificant volumes, the fourth of which has recently appeared. The first volume is their condemnation.

HOW TO PREACH THE GOSPEL WITH VARIETY AND FRESHNESS.*

The position occupied by the regularly acknowledged preacher is one of immense importance. To have the opportunity of addressing even fifty persons, and, still more, the opportunity of addressing hundreds, twice or thrice each week for a succession of years, is a privilege, the importance of which it is not easy to estimate. To improve such a privilege thoroughly is worthy of the loftiest ambition; to fail to improve it must bring, in the end, the direst regret. But such a privilege can not possibly be improved unless the preacher is successful in giving constant variety and freshness to his regular ministrations. Sameness and staleness in any thing are utterly incompatible with hearty acceptance on the part of man. That which is characterized by such qualities may be endured, but can never be enjoyed; nor can it call forth the spirit of the human being to that for which Jehovah has designed it. The variety of nature, of providence, and of revelation, is endless. The mind of man has been so constituted as to depend, in no small degree, for its enjoyment and stimulus on this variety. The unceasing change in which something new is perpetually turning up for us meets a demand of our spirits, and its supply is essential to every thing like happiness and progress. Man must have something fresh, and that continually, or he flags, becomes miserable, and dies to all that makes existence truly desirable. This is just as true in relation to the Gospel, when it is preached to men, as it is true of any thing else on which their prosperity depends. Hence the very great importance of knowing how to secure both variety and freshness in the preaching of that Gospel.

It may be necessary to remark here that, while every preacher is more or less aware of the necessity for variety and freshness in his public teaching, all are not aware that these qualities may characterize their constant preaching of the glad tidings of Christ. Some, at least, imagine that what is, strictly speaking, called the Gospel, must occupy only a small portion of the field of public ministrations, if their pulpit-work is to be strongly characterized by variety and freshness. They consequently seek to give these

* From the (Glasgow) *Evangelical Repository*, March, 1864.

qualities to the instruction which they communicate, by taking up a vast number of subjects, and by preaching, in general, on things which, as they view it, are wide away from the momentous truth that actually saves the soul. A preacher who embraces and follows out such an idea as this, is in great danger of sacrificing the truly Gospel element, in his preaching, at the shrine of variety and freshness. He is like a man who should, in a great measure, refrain from giving his children that food on which life and health must be sustained, for the sake of giving them always something new. He will, perhaps, be very much surprised, though he ought not to be surprised at all, to find that, after years of such preaching, his ministry has been a failure. The variety and freshness which are of real value are those which belong to the preaching of the Gospel, the glad tidings that save the guilty man. It is when the preacher keeps most closely to the grand essence of the Gospel itself, and yet gives a constant variety and freshness to his teaching, that he is a truly successful preacher of Christ. In view of this, it is not so important to show how variety and freshness may be given to public teaching, generally considered, as it is to indicate how these qualities may be made to characterize the preaching of that truth, or cluster of truths, which is properly styled the Gospel.

To preach the Gospel is, no doubt, to speak of one Savior only. So far as the number of Saviors is concerned, no variety is possible. That Glorious One, of whom all true preaching of the Gospel must tell us, is "the same yesterday, to-day, and forever." To whatever extent we give variety to our preaching of the Gospel, that preaching must tend to inform the hearer of this Living One, or it ceases to be the preaching of the Gospel of Christ. But it is impossible to give any information of value regarding Jesus without giving information regarding the Father and the Holy Spirit, too; while it is impossible to teach truly regarding these subsistences in the Divine One, without also showing their relationship to the Son and his saving work. Here, then, is a field in which variety at once presents itself to the preacher of the Gospel, in the strictest sense of the term. If he has really acquired that knowledge of a three-one God which is essential to his fitness for regularly preaching to his fellow-men, and if he is prepared to "follow on to know the Lord," so as to keep the supplies of his mind adequate to the expenditure which his work

demands, he can be at no loss for variety of theme. That ocean of truth, from the wide waves of which we may tell of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, will furnish him with an endless stream of subjects for pulpit instruction, all differing from each other, while every one of them will naturally lead to a direct preaching of the soul-saving Gospel. There is, indeed, not one thing that we can know of either Father, Son, or Holy Ghost which is not intimately connected with that Divine love to mankind and that justice propitiated for man which form the grand essence of the evangelical truth; and it can not, for a moment, be doubted that there is variety enough in what may be ever increasingly known of Jehovah. Suppose, for example, that a preacher takes up the subject of the creation of this globe on which we live: how can he show the grand design of the Creator, as the eternal Father of mankind, without opening up that very love which gave Jesus as a sacrifice for the immortal children for whom the earth was so wondrously prepared as a dwelling? No doubt one who knows nothing of that love (and, perhaps, cares as little as he knows) will dwell on the construction of the habitation, and fail to think of the intention or heart of the Divine Architect and Builder of the world. But such a man lacks the first essential qualification for preaching the Gospel. To go to the opposite extreme for another example, let us suppose a sermon on the last judgment: how shall any one rightly tell of that sublime consummation without preaching Jesus, who shall then sit enthroned as Judge of all? And how shall he preach Jesus without, in some degree, preaching the Gospel? How can he tell the true character of the Judge, the true principles of the judgment itself, or describe the memories of that dread day, without going back to Calvary, and speaking of the grounds of pardon now and of condemnation then? But the preacher, desiring to give variety to his instructions, does not need to confine himself to those vast fields that are found in the heart and working of Jehovah. He can range over all that can be known of heaven, of hell, and of earth, with their inhabitants. All this is ever closely connected with vital Gospel preaching. How shall he adequately describe an angel's mind without speaking of the sympathy of the angelic heart with that of God, as it burns with compassion for fallen man? How shall he truthfully declare how the "spirits of the just made perfect" feel in glory, and keep

away from the burden of their new song? And how shall he preach on that song without preaching the Gospel? Then, if he descends to the dreadful regions of woe, how shall he say any thing to the purpose regarding them, without showing that it is the rejection of Christ and the Gospel alone that could bring men to an equality in guilt with the angels who fell? It is true that a man may speak of all these great subjects in such a way as to leave the Gospel out of sight. It is true that many actually preach even of Christ's crucifixion itself, and yet seem to be ignorant that it has any connection with the righteous ransoming of guilty man. But such preaching, instead of being natural, is unspeakably the opposite.

If, again, the preacher looks to the field of thought, which is furnished by this world and by the experience and history of man, he has a variety—an endless variety—of subjects, all inseparable from the Gospel, except by the most flagrant oversight on the part of the preacher. Two things only are required: first, that he shall avail himself of the endlessly varied subjects which the fields of divinity and humanity present; and secondly, that he shall see the natural relation in which the Gospel stands to each of these subjects. He does not require to *lug in* the Gospel truth. It is already there, if he will only see it. He does not need to *blend* that truth with his theme. It is already blended with all that affects God and his intelligent creation. He has only to speak of the case as it stands, and whatever that case may be, he will have something precious to say of the love from Jehovah's heart and of the ransom of Jesus. Suppose, for example, that he preaches on the brevity of human life in this world, what interest can there be in his subject apart from that knowledge of God in Christ which is "life eternal?" Or, if he should take up any point of human duty, what can he say that will secure its discharge, if he supply not the all-powerful motives of the Gospel? Or, if he should select for his subject any sin, in what light will he place it so as to show its hatefulness, if not in that of the cross of Immanuel? Or, if he preach of any human trial, how shall he avoid tantalizing his hearers if he furnish not Gospel consolation drawn from the life and death of the man of sorrows? The preacher who is alive to the value of variety in his preaching, and who, at the same time, feels the solemn reality of the "woe" which must abide on him who preaches,

but does not preach the Gospel, can never be at a loss if he keep the relationship, which we are thus illustrating, in view.

The quality of freshness in pulpit instruction is very distinct from that of variety. A preacher may secure endless variety of subjects, and yet totally fail to give freshness to the discourses which he delivers. He may never take the same theme twice, and yet there may be a staleness about all he says which will effectually defeat the great ends of his ministry. He may never fail to preach the Gospel in connection with the topic on which he dilates, yet he may so preach it that he will fail to feel, even himself, as if he were doing any thing else than saying over an old and oft-repeated set of words to a listless auditory. Variety has to do, in a great measure, with the objects presented to the people, or with the aspects in which these objects may be held up to them. Freshness has more to do with the intellectual position of the preacher and the people themselves. A discourse, in order to be fresh to the people, must, in some of its features, be new to them, and, in order to be fresh to both preacher and people, it must, in some degree, be new to both. The preacher should have something new to tell, or, at least, he should have been making progress in the knowledge of his subject since he last spoke on it, so that he may have something to say which will be really in advance of the people's thoughts on the theme on which he addresses them. Stagnation is fatal to freshness. So is a perpetual repetition of that which is already familiar to the ear and mind. Consequently, the preacher who imagines that he already knows all Gospel truth, and who never looks out for any fresh discovery in that field, is not likely to preach the Gospel with any feeling of freshness in his own mind. Just so the preacher who imagines that his hearers already know all about the Gospel can scarcely be expected to exert himself so as to give them any thing fresh of an evangelical nature. The spirit of discovery and the enthusiasm of him who relates his own discoveries, are essential to freshness in all preaching. The man who comes to the pulpit feeling sure that he has got something to tell which he did not know before, and which few, if any, of his hearers know now, will hardly fail to preach with freshness; he will certainly enjoy a feeling of freshness in his own mind, and he will be far behind, indeed, if he does not communicate something fresh to most of his hearers. He who goes to the pulpit to repeat a carefully

prepared composition, the substance of which he feels as if he had always known, and as if every body else had always known as well, may, no doubt, very energetically deliver his recitation, but he will feel nothing of the bracing sea-breeze of truth, which is essential to a fresh feeling in his own soul, and just as truly essential to that feeling on the part of the great mass of society. This suggests to us a vital element in the preparation of a really fresh discourse. Suppose a preacher sits down to study, even after having prayerfully and carefully chosen his text. He has no idea of discovery. His first thought is about a suitable "introduction." That is got together in the shape of a few sentences, such as most of the people have heard, for the thousandth time, perhaps, on the "connection" of the passage in hand. Then he is concerned about the "division." He has some "skeletons" at hand on the shelf, and he consults the anatomy of the text, so far as the bones go, in the light of these old and very dry constructions. Still no vision of any thing new flits across his mind. He is not seeking something fresh, but only endeavoring to put together an orthodox and passable sermon. He has at length got his bones, and now for words so far to clothe them. These he gathers from the most commonplace quarters. Then he must have some illustrations. And he has recourse to incidents or figures, all as familiar to his own mind and to the minds of his hearers as the stalest matter of memory can possibly be. By and by he has "got up" his discourse, and he must commit it to memory: so he turns over and over the body he has formed, as if a sufficient amount of such a revolving process could ever make it fresh or fruitful. He goes up to the pulpit at last to exhibit his workmanship to his congregation. But he has no conception that he has himself found some rich new thought in the Gospel, and that, in delivering his discourse, he is communicating fresh knowledge to those who hear him. How can there be freshness in such a service?

Suppose another and different case. A preacher is carefully reading the word of God, and his mind is arrested by something important in a text of that word which never struck him before. He examines the passage with care, so as to make sure that the thought with which it seems to have arrested him is really a true and likely to be a useful thought. By and by the text gleams before him with new and genuine light. He consid-

ers how he may best communicate the fresh thought, which has affected his own heart, to the minds of his people. Where and how should he begin to tell them of it? How should he go on telling them? What great object may be gained if he succeed in getting them to see as he himself has been led to see? His mind is getting full of his discovery. Old truth seems new in the glory of fresh ideas. Illustrations of the character and value of his subject are occurring to him. These two come from new regions, or are at least themselves new. If he writes, it is to get his thoughts compressed and arranged, not to "get up" a discourse. If he commits, it is to train his mind and bridle his tongue, in giving forth the abundance of his heart. Does any one imagine that such a sermon will lack freshness? It can not possibly lack it. But let us suppose another case. When the preacher has fixed upon his text, it may be an exceedingly common one; though some new thought may have struck him in connection with it, he will probably find that the old and much-worn way of treating it is, after all, strongly impressed upon his mind. He should avoid that. Indeed, he must avoid it, if he would do justice to his theme. He may begin with the usual division and topics associated with the text, but only to set them aside, and to disabuse his hearers of the thought that he is about to lead them along an old, worn-out path. He will thus clear the ground for the acceptable statement of a really fresh discovery of the rich thought that is involved in the expression with which he is dealing. As an instance of what we here mean, the preacher may have fixed upon the text, "I will have mercy and not sacrifice," (as in Matt. xii: 7). He has at least two totally different aspects of the great truth presented by such a text, between which he may choose. The one calls for the discussion of the duty of man to show mercy, rather than to offer formal worship. This leads very readily to a commonplace treatment of the whole subject. The other aspect directs the mind to the character of the Savior, as one who prefers the merciful heart in his creatures to the worship which, without such a heart, they may render; and who, though himself by far the most deeply wounded by sin, pleads with guilty man to have mercy on his guilty brother. Opening out the character of Immanuel, in dwelling on this view of the text, the preacher's treatment of his theme will scarcely fail to be full of delightful freshness, while the discus-

sion of the duty of mere man toward his fellow will be likely to be comparatively stale.

But we must go to another field to show how the preacher may secure freshness in his preaching. He must have as much close spiritual conversation with his people, or at least with some people, as he readily can command. He will discover in such intercourse what subjects and aspects of the saving truth are familiar, and what of that truth is strange to their minds. He will not find it difficult to ascertain that there is great room for the introduction of fresh thought to the ordinary mind. Thus he will be guided to that preaching which, even if it have not the quality of freshness to himself, will be sure to possess that quality to the minds of those who hear him. He will avoid presenting that with which they are already familiar; and he will find abundant means of leading them ever onward to fuller and richer views of the precious Savior. It is impossible to overestimate the importance of real success in so preaching the Gospel.

Something might very well be said as to freshness in relation to tone and manner, as well as in reference to matter, in the preaching of Christ. If the preacher allows himself to get into a sing-song habit of delivery, the freshness of the freshest thought will be in danger of being lost to his hearers. No doubt he will be likely to escape this if he has due regard for variety and freshness in the more important department of his momentous work. When he comes to the pulpit with the enthusiasm of a man who has something new and important to tell, we can scarcely conceive of his falling into a hum-drum mode of telling it. Still, it is not unnecessary that he should be on his guard against the stealthy advance of such an evil.

The youngest and least experienced of preachers need have no misgiving as regards his ability to give, even in a high degree, variety and freshness to his preaching of the Gospel. In some respects he is in a more favorable situation for success, in this respect, than the man of riper years. Many things that have ceased so excite the enthusiasm of the advanced in life possess all the charm of novelty to the young; and these are all in favor of the variety and freshness with which an earnest and studious youth may instruct and persuade his fellow-men. He has only to be a true student, and as a student a real personal discoverer

of the glories of the Gospel, a constant discoverer of fresh glories in that Gospel, in order to be so inspired himself as to feel constrained to tell of the riches which he finds stored in the unsearchable mine of Christ. His preaching, in such a case, will inevitably be characterized by variety and freshness. Even if it should not be so profound or so lofty as it will by and by become, it will certainly be as varied and fresh as could be reasonably desired. Should the limits of his knowledge be far within those that have long since been reached by some of the more advanced of his hearers, there will be a charm in the freshness of his ingenuous utterances of even well-known truths that will never fail to give pleasure, or to call forth the hearty "God speed him" from maturer minds. Who does not know what it is to feel the heart gladdened by even a child's enthusiastic announcement of discoveries that are immensely important as such to him, though they have long since ceased to be new to older men? The one essential quality in all such announcements is, that the discoveries proclaimed are truly the preacher's own. The spirit of man is never affected by any thing of this nature which is at best only second-hand, and given forth by the preacher as something which another has told him, and which he merely repeats as a "hearsay" which he believes. While we must receive most of our thoughts from others, and so must give, in preaching, what we have received, we must so receive these thoughts that they become the actual discoveries of our own minds, and fill and influence our minds to such a degree that they come pouring forth in language which is strictly our own. It seems to be a principle inherent in the very nature of our progressive, intellectual, and moral life, that the ideas that are to affect us powerfully should be personal discoveries by those who teach us, and also and equally personal discoveries to those who are delighted and benefited by their teaching. For the fullest operation of this principle there is ample scope in the immensities of Gospel truth. When shall we ever exhaust the treasures of that divinely varied and eternal region of blissful thought which embraces all the fullness of God in Christ Jesus? Let the youngest and oldest alike be assured that if we only study, investigate, explore, and increasingly store up fresh supplies of "the unsearchable riches," we shall have more than enough to give perennial freshness and ever-growing power to our preaching of the glorious Gospel.

BIBLICAL BOTANY.*

Biblical Botany is one of the most interesting departments of sacred literature. The vegetable productions of that hallowed land, where all the nations of the earth come together to worship, over whose acres walked the blessed feet of our Redeemer, and whose every object and scene are indelibly associated with the most momentous incidents in the history of mankind, have a perpetual attraction, an irresistible fascination about them, which those of no other country possess. Memorial plants, which grow amid scenes consecrated by the poet's song or the hero's devotion, have ever a wondrous power of appeal to our deepest sympathies. We value a flower, however lowly, plucked from storied ground, incomparably more than one found in a common situation, however distinguished for beauty or fragrance. A blade of grass from the grave of Bunyan; a wall-flower from the ruined shrines of Iona; or a sprig of that southernwood which, as Kinglake touchingly relates, reminded the British soldiers in the Crimea of home, by its familiar perfume, crushed out under the horses' hoofs in the battle charge: these things, mere trifles in themselves, possessing no intrinsic beauty or value, speak to the dullest soul in language that can not be mistaken. Every one can understand the feelings that overpowered Dr. Carey, when he observed a daisy springing up in his garden at Serampore, having been conveyed to India in earth with other seeds; or the emotion that thrilled all hearts in an Australian city, when it was announced that a primrose from England had just arrived by ship, in full bloom, in a flower-pot. Verily the charm of association is more powerful than any other charm, idealizing and beautifying the humblest and most familiar object. And if its influence be felt so keenly in the cases we have mentioned, how much more strongly must it operate in every thing connected with that strange country, whose very dust and rubbish are dear to every Christian heart, in the case of those flowers on whose ancestors, in the very same spots, the eye of Jesus rested in admiration and blessing—

* From the *British and Foreign Evangelical Review, Jan.*, 1864.

and which he canonized and associated forever with himself—in lessons of undying beauty and wisdom! The rose of Sharon and the lily of the valley are more precious to us because they were deemed worthy to form emblems of him who was altogether lovely. As the very streams in an Alpine region run conscious of the mountains; as every tree and flower has something more than its own beauty or majesty, when it grows in the shadow, or in the light of those purple ranges that seem the commingling of heaven and earth; so the light of that wonderful Book—so human, yet so divine—sheds a halo of the deepest interest over every plant on which it rests; we gather with the flowers, over whose progenitors the shadow of the God-man must sometimes have passed during his weary pilgrimage on earth, more and other beauty than what the dews and the sunshine of heaven had nourished in them. The names of most of these sacred plants are familiar to us as household words. They were among the earliest lessons we learned at a mother's knee. Many a simple child, or untutored peasant, who is altogether ignorant of the names and histories of the wild flowers which spring up, season after season, in the fields and woods around his home, knows of that fig-tree which our Savior blasted for its barrenness, knows of that sycamore into whose branches Zaccheus climbed to gratify a blessed curiosity, knows of the lilies of Mount Tabor, pronounced by him who made them, more richly arrayed in nature's robes than Solomon in all his glory. Many an humble scholar, untaught in all other botanical lore, is learned in the mint, anise, and cumin of the New Testament, and can see in imagination the cedar forest of Lebanón, the palm-grove of Jericho, and the venerable olives in the Garden of Gethsemane, in whose mysterious shadow the darkest hour of earthly agony was spent, more vividly than any description can enable him to realize the glories of tropical forests, or the vineyards and orange-groves that are nearer at hand.

But though the subject of Scripture botany is thus surrounded with a romantic interest, and is familiar in its general aspect, and in the garb of an English translation, to the popular mind, there is, in reality, no department of biblical research in which the scientific student encounters greater difficulties and perplexities. These arise chiefly from two sources: first, the obscurity in which almost every allusion to plants in the Bible is involved;

and, secondly, the peculiar political condition of Bible lands, which has hitherto prevented a thorough investigation of their natural history. We have a few remarks to offer on both these heads. In regard to the first, we observe that no class of writers ever derived more assistance from the physical world in the illustration of their works than the authors of the Bible. They lived in the very eye of nature, amid some of her grandest and most striking scenes, in a state of society more favorable for the cultivation of the observing than of the reflecting faculties. Engaged, at least in early years, in the various employments of rural life as shepherds and farmers, they were necessarily brought into close and frequent contact with the varied aspects and objects of nature, and thus their thoughts and feelings were strongly tinctured with her hues. But when they felt the impulse of inspiration, their love of nature and their use of natural imagery were modified and kept within narrower limits than they might otherwise have preserved, by an all-controlling sense of God's presence and power. Henceforth, creation was referred by them to the divine will and thought as the center, the root, and end of all things; nature was regarded as a mere shadow of something higher and better, and the visible world as a hieroglyph of the spiritual, as a mirror in which to behold the perfections of God. The wealth of poetic materials borrowed from the external world, strewn over their pages, was employed by them only in the way of incidental illustration and allusion. Their writings exhibit no artistic appreciation of nature as nature, no love of beauty, sublimity, or picturesqueness simply for their own sakes. Not one object is described purely for its own intrinsic interest; no landscape is portrayed for its mere scenic effect. There is no lingering with satisfied admiration, no dwelling with fond fancy upon the beauties of nature, as we find in the works of our own poets. There is no filling in of the sketch, no shading of the outline with the hues of life. Each writer, wholly occupied with his consciousness of the overshadowing presence of God, hurries on from the image to the meaning behind it, from the illustration to the truth which it is intended to convey and enforce. The trees, the flowers, the hills, the streams, the birds, and beasts, are alluded to only and purely to express their high thoughts of God, as a pictorial language of trust, prophecy, or prayer; never for the sake of their individual peculiarities. This is the sublime

characteristic of Hebrew literature, which separates it from all other literature whatever; but, for this very reason, there is a certain indefiniteness about many of the Scriptural illustrations, especially those derived from the vegetable kingdom, which places almost insuperable difficulties in the way when they are treated as independent subjects of research. Many of the Scripture plants are, as it were, so rapidly floated past us on the impetuous stream of the narrative, that we only obtain a hurried, shadowy glimpse of their forms; in that majestic, solemn drama, in which mankind, devils, angels, and God himself, are actors, we could not expect, and we do not receive that fullness of detail, and that rich, not to say exaggerated, coloring, which characterises other and less important history. And this peculiar dignity of the Bible, we can not help remarking by the way, offers a silent rebuke to that pertinacious minutiæ of illustration smothering the text, and that over-explanatory teaching, forcing our attention upon matters of comparatively little significance, and wearying us often into incredulity, when, if left to ourselves, we could not choose but believe, which seems to distinguish most of the religious education of the present day. The names of Bible plants, therefore, furnishing no internal clue for our guidance, and frequently alluded to in the briefest and most cursory manner, by a single word, may be regarded as so many hieroglyphics, to which, in the course of ages, the key has been lost, and are, consequently, as difficult to decipher as the cuneiform inscriptions of Persepolis and Assyria. The attempts of our translators to find their English equivalents are mere guesses and gropings in the dark; ignorant, all of them, of botanical science, and dealing with words which suggested no corresponding ideas to their minds, the wonder is, not that they have committed so many mistakes, but that, in any single instance, they have made even an approximation to the truth. In our difficulties we have no assistance whatever from without, from works contemporary with the sacred writings.

All the secular literature of the ancient Jews perished in the wreck of ages. Solomon's treatises on natural history, which would have been an invaluable treasure to us now, are hopelessly lost; and it is, it must be confessed, a somewhat tantalizing circumstance to alight incidentally upon the great fact of some specific and distinguished connection with literature, indicated in

the name of Kirjath-Sepher, or Book City—one of the Canaanite towns taken by Joshua—when nothing now remains of that connection but the name. Nor did the Jews ever attempt to compensate for this loss. Wrapped up in their own haughty and exclusive fanaticism, and despising all knowledge save that of law and the traditions of the Fathers, they held no intercourse with surrounding nations, who returned their hatred with interest. The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan Ben Uziel, though valuable in an exegetical point of view, throw no additional light upon biblical botany: while the works of Josephus and Philo Judæus contain few allusions to the subject of any consequence. The same may be said regarding nearly all the Rabbinical writers who have commented upon the sacred record, from that period to the present day. When they stumbled upon the name of a plant which they could not very well avoid noticing, they dexterously extricated themselves out of the difficulty by the sententious remark either that "It was a species of herb or tree;" or that "It was not easy to know what it was."

The other difficulty alluded to in the scientific investigation of Scripture botany, is connected with the peculiar political position of the Holy Land. There is no part of the world, of the same extent and physical character, so difficult to explore. It is visited by thousands annually from every quarter, and so many books have been written upon it, that the subject is quite hackneyed. People of rank and wealth, in search of a new sensation, after exhausting Europe; literary men, who intend to coin their travels into money; professional divines in search of fresh materials for an exegetical treatise; the accomplished men of science crowd upon each others' footsteps in rapid succession, year after year: but the wanderings of these pilgrims are confined almost exclusively to the old and well-beaten tracks, and we are afflicted in consequence with a woeful monotony of tone and sameness of aspect in their revelations. The unsettled state of the country makes it dangerous to travel in certain districts in search of plants, and the information regarding them which may be gathered on the spot from the common people, by one conversant with Hebrew, Syriac, and Arabic, without the incumbrance of a large and well-armed escort, is beyond the means of most private scientific men. Under the effects and tyrannical government of the Turks, every thing withers, from commercial enterprise to family

comfort; neither life nor property can be said to be safe for a single moment, even in the most peaceful localities. Travelers are frequently waylaid, robbed, and murdered, with impunity. Hordes of robbers, Bedouins from the desert, and discontented tribes from the mountains, carry on a guerrilla warfare with each other, like that which exists at present among the brigands of revolutionary Italy. In consequence of this sad state of things, existing now for many centuries, nothing like a general, exhaustive, systematic description of the plants indigenous to, or growing within, the area of the country, has ever been attempted by any nation. While the wildest parts of the Andes and Himalayas, the almost inaccessible valleys of the Altai range, and the remotest islands of the Pacific, have each their vegetation fully investigated and carefully systematized by the labors of recent botanists, Palestine is almost the only country whose flora has never been explored or published. There have been, indeed, occasional brief notices of the vegetation of isolated districts, in the works of scientific writers; and in the histories of those scientific expeditions sent out from time to time, chiefly for topographical purposes, by the English, French, and American Governments. The journals of Niebuhr and Burckhardt occasionally allude to the plants that came within the range of their own observation; but botany was only one, and that a very subsidiary, object of their travels. Tournefort, one of the most accomplished botanists of his time, from whom the idea of the geographical distribution of plants in latitude and altitude was first derived, describes a large number of the plants of Asia Minor. Hasselquist, a Swedish naturalist, and one of the most eminent of the disciples of Linnæus, prosecuted, in Palestine, special researches in botany, under the patronage of, and at the expense of, the University of Upsal, in 1751. He remained some time in Jerusalem, and afterward visited other parts of the country, dying at Smyrna, in the following year, a martyr in the cause of science, after having amassed a large and valuable collection of natural curiosities. This interesting collection was purchased by the Swedish Queen, Louisa Ulrica, and was deposited in the castle of Drottningholm, where, we believe, it may be seen at the present day. Linnæus, from the papers and specimens collected by his pupil, prepared for the press the "Iter Palæstinum," or, "Travels in Palestine, with remarks on its Natural History," a work published at Stock-

holm, in 1757, and translated into English and other European languages, though now very scarce. Hasselquist did more to explore, personally, the botany of the Holy Land than any other ancient or modern author, but his observations, owing to his premature decease, the limited resources at his command, and, consequently, the small space of ground over which he could travel, and the superficial and hurried manner in which he was obliged to conduct his researches, were, necessarily, brief and scanty, and do not throw very much light upon Biblical botany. We sincerely add our amen to the hope expressed by Professor Balfour, that travelers in future may have greater facilities afforded them for prosecuting with safety their researches in that interesting, although now deserted land, and that some botanist may soon arise who will be able to write with scientific accuracy on all the Scripture plants, "from the cedar of Lebanon to the hyssop that groweth out of the wall." As if to encourage this hope, we learn that a scientific expedition, headed by the Rev. H. B. Tristram, has recently passed through Malta for Syria, for the express purpose of investigating the geology, zoölogy, and botany of the Holy Land. The *Malta Times* states that the expedition is abundantly furnished with every requisite for the objects it has in view, in the way of scientific instruments, traps for catching the smaller mammals and reptiles, nets for fishing in the Jordan, etc.; and includes in its staff a skilled taxidermist from the Zoölogical Society. A photographer also accompanies the expedition, the results of whose exertions will doubtless afford a valuable adjunct to the labors of the party, which, if the state of the country permit, are intended to extend over a period of six or eight months.

Deprived in a great measure of information from the two direct sources we have thus indicated, we are indebted for the scanty, imperfect knowledge we happen to possess of Scripture botany, to the works of the Greek botanists Theophrastus and Dioscorides. There is an admirable commentary upon the *Materia Medica* of the latter author, published by Mathiolus, the celebrated botanist, in Venice, in 1565, which furnishes valuable information regarding the plants whose range extended round the shores of the Ægean Sea and the Levant. We owe much, also, to the Arabians, who paid great attention to almost every department of learning at a period when ignorance and barbarism over-

spread every part of the western world. Botany, as subsidiary to medicine, was cultivated by them with distinguished success, and advanced greatly beyond the condition in which it had been left by Dioscorides. The plants of all the surrounding countries were investigated and classified with considerable scientific exactness, chiefly by Rhazes, Ali Abbas, and Avicenna. Through the labors of Albiruni, and Ibn Al Beithar, a native of Malaga, and the most distinguished of all the Arabian botanists, both of whom travelled over every part of southern Europe, northern Africa, and western Asia for many years, observing the nature and properties of the vegetable kingdom, upward of two thousand plants, many of them the productions of Palestine, Egypt, and Arabia, were added to the lists previously known. To the works of these Arabian botanists, the Jewish rabbis had recourse for a solution of the difficulties they encountered in the identification of Scripture plants; and Celsius himself candidly acknowledges his great obligations to a bulky Arabian MS., by Abn'l Fadli, which fell into his hands accidentally at Upsal, containing copious extracts from all the best Arabian writers on every subject calculated to illustrate Oriental natural history. Nor is it merely to the botanical literature of the Arabs that we are indebted; their spoken language, as a cognate dialect of the Hebrew, has also been of great service in the cause. By comparison of Scripture names of plants with Arabic words in use among the people at the present day, Dr. Royle was enabled to identify many species to which no other clue could be found, and to confirm the opinions he had been previously led to form regarding other species, from the circumstances and terms in which they were alluded to in the sacred text. The great lexicon of Firouzabad, the Johnson of Arabia, called the "Ocean" (Al Kamus), contains many names of plants so similar to the Hebrew ones, and so evidently derived from the same roots, that there can be no doubt that they refer to the same objects. The face of nature, in its rugged and wild monotony, was studied in the desert with a minuteness of which we can form no conception, for not only was there a separate name for every object, but even for every varying phase and appearance of it; and this vast accumulation of epithets, for which the Arabian language is remarkable, remains to this day as stereotyped and unchanged as the aspect of the country, and the manners and customs of the people.

Of modern works on Scripture botany, the oldest, and, in many respects, the best, is the "Hierobotanicon" of Celsius. It was written *con amore*, and bears evidence of having occupied, for many years, all the spare time of its author. One is almost dismayed by the proofs of immense erudition which it displays on every page. We used to consider the article of Sir William Hamilton on the Philosophy of Common Sense a marvel of learning and research; but it is paralleled, if not excelled, in its own way, by the work of the indefatigable Swede. Whole libraries of Oriental and classical lore are ground down and digested in it; and every page bristles with quotations in Greek, Hebrew, and Arabic. All the stores of antiquity, the writings of classic authors, both Greek and Roman, the works of Dioscorides and Theophrastus, the commentaries of Jewish rabbis, the treatises of Arabian doctors, the floras of European botanists, have all been carefully examined, and every thing bearing on the subject culled from them and incorporated. Each plant mentioned in the Bible—and there are upward of one hundred and thirty described by Celsius—has not only its botanical peculiarities carefully analyzed, but its philological history is also traced, with exemplary patience, through a maze of perplexities and a labyrinth of languages and authorities which would have daunted any one but a German or a Swede. The work has proved a valuable mine, from which almost all subsequent writers upon the subject have dug their materials. Kitto was greatly indebted to it; and many parts of his descriptions of plants in his Cyclopedia are mere translations of his text. Of Professor Balfour's "Plants of the Bible" we have a very favorable opinion. It is a beautiful volume, more adapted, however, for the drawing-room than the student's shelf, got up in the most elegant manner, and illustrated by very fine chromo lithographs of nearly all the plants described. Like all the scientific works of this accomplished author, it is written in a clear, terse style, and conveys a great deal of information in a small compass. We regard it as an exceedingly satisfactory circumstance in this age of loose dogmatism and flippant skepticism, that this subject should have been taken up and illustrated by a mind imbued at once with the clearest light of science, and with the spirit of the Bible. One has a feeling of confidence in traversing the wilderness of Bible botany under the leadership of one whose acquaintance with botanical literature, past and present,

and, also, with plants preserved in herbariums, and growing in gardens and conservatories, is such as to qualify him, in an eminent degree, to pronounce a decided opinion on disputed points. In the volume already published we have merely an installment of the subject; it treats only of the trees and shrubs of Scripture. A second volume, descriptive of the herbaceous plants, will be published shortly. It is the intention of the author, we believe, to remodel the whole work, and bring it out in a more popular form, and at a cheaper price. Should this intention be fulfilled, it will supply a desideratum long felt, and prove a boon to students of the Bible, as well as to the general reader. A small publication has been issued by the Religious Tract Society, which is a marvel of cheapness, considering its size and the excellence of its materials. It may be obtained in paper covers for sixpence; and any one studying it carefully would not, by any means, be indifferently versed in Biblical botany. It is written in a pleasing, popular style, while, at the same time, it is scientifically accurate so far as it goes. Were we disposed to find fault with it, we should say that it is a little too rhetorical at times, and indulges rather freely in moralizing. But, possibly, to the class of minds for whom it was written, this may be rather a recommendation than otherwise. We should, perhaps, desiderate a little more of life and picturesqueness in all the books on this subject that have passed through our hands. They are all more or less dry and didactic, and destitute of literary grace; one peruses them more for information than pleasure. A more suggestive subject, or one more capable of being made interesting by the aid of adventitious circumstances and picturesque coloring from associations of sacred scenery and incident, could not be easily found. Mr. Archibald Gorrie published a very modest but useful and interesting little work on descriptive botany, which is not so well known as it deserves to be. We have seen a clever paper of his, read before the Botanical Society of Edinburgh, on the botany of the Hebrews, intended chiefly to show the Hebrew etymology of the names of plants mentioned in the Old Testament, and that, in most instances, these names were descriptive of the peculiar appearance, uses, or virtues of the different plants to which they are understood to have been applied. It would be wrong to pass over the learned and elaborate writings of Dr. Royle, which have done so much to place our subject on a more satisfactory basis.

This author, an admirable botanist and philologist, uniting in his own person and circumstances all the qualifications necessary for the task, took very great pains to identify the plants of Scripture by a careful examination of the plants exposed for sale in the Indian bazaars and the general botany of the East, and by tracing the affinities between Hebrew, Arabic, and Sanscrit words descriptive of vegetation. His work is too learned and expensive, however, to be within reach of the ordinary reader; but the more important of his conclusions, as well as those of Rosenmüller, are embodied in a popular form in Kitto's Cyclopedia, and Physical Geography of Palestine—works accessible to every one.

It may be interesting to lay some of the information we have gleaned from these and other sources before the reader. The subject is too extensive to be noticed in detail; the poetry of the Bible, abundant as it is in reference to all objects of nature, being so peculiarly rich in its allusions to trees, herbs, and flowers, that Michaelis has called it botanical poetry. Plants are alluded to in nearly three hundred places in the sacred volume; it would be manifestly impossible, therefore, within our narrow limits, to do more than notice, cursorily, the more remarkable and characteristic species. Before proceeding to describe these, a slight passing glance at the geology and climate of Palestine may be taken, for every one who has studied physical geography must be aware how much the character and distribution of vegetation are affected by these causes. The physical features of the Holy Land are very remarkable. The whole country is in a chaotic geological condition. In no other part of the world, within the same narrow area, was volcanic action so intense and concentrated. The ground has been so upheaved, and cleft, and jammed together, that it is difficult, in many places, to say what kind of stratum lies uppermost and what beneath, or to judge from position of priority of formation. Granite, limestone, and trap, which are the prevailing formations, are tumbled together as if they had been flung down any how out of a Titan's hod, and left to lie where they fell. Everywhere are evidences of convulsion and wreck, and of new conditions created on the ruins of the old. Especially is this the case toward the southern extremity of the country. All around that region, rendered forever memorable by one of the most awful

and mysterious events in the history of the human race, may be seen traces of the most frightful spasms of nature, extinct volcanoes and tremendous clefts, mountains dislocated and shattered in pieces, and tracts of unparalleled desolation. The great peculiarity of the country, as a whole, is the succession of terraces and table-lands, isolated by circumvallations of rugged buttresses and precipices, alternating with wide-spreading and perfectly level plains. There are no gently undulating slopes connecting the mountains with the low grounds, no commingling of hill and dale, which forms such a beautiful feature in our scenery. There are either stern, steep, and barren mountains, or rich and fertile plains, so flat and monotonous as to suggest the idea of their being formerly the beds of immense lakes or inland seas. This abrupt arrangement of the scenery breaks up the flora into definite and well-marked classes, and tends to circumscribe the area of herbaceous plants.

Being strictly a mountainous country, the Holy Land includes a considerable variety of climates, respectively suited to different classes of plants. It ascends in the north upwards of 10,000 feet above the level of the Mediterranean; whereas, at the southern extremity, it sinks 1,337 feet below this point, and forms the deepest and most extraordinary depression in the surface of the globe. The climate of the former region is, therefore, temperate, while that of the other is almost tropical. Between these two extremes, the various climates of different localities differ as much from each other as England and Madeira, or, perhaps, more. In the plains and valleys, and along the sea-board, the heat in summer is oppressive, but, in the mountainous districts, the air is mild, and the nights cool and dewy. Palestine lies just outside the tropical zone, where the palms disappear and the evergreens are plentiful. Its average annual temperature is 69°; the isothermal line of 72° passing a little to the south of it. Snow falls more or less in the north, but never lies, in the severest winter, more than a few hours on the ground. From March to October, rain rarely, if ever, falls; the sky is usually cloudless, and the sun pours down his scorching rays with unmitigated fierceness, burning up every green thing, drying the fountains and smaller streams, and imparting to the whole country an aspect of sterility and drought painful to witness. From October to March, rain falls with more or less regularity, the heaviest

rain-fall being in the months of November and December. The north wind, blowing over the snowy peaks of Lebanon, is keen and cold; the south wind, coming from the deserts of Arabia, is sultry and oppressive; while the east wind is pestilential, and very injurious to animal and vegetable life. The west winds are the only winds favorable to vegetation. They come laden with moisture from the Mediterranean, and discharge their burden of mild, balmy rain on the mountain districts during the winter months, when they principally prevail.

The physical structure and conformation of Palestine, as well as its climate and meteorology, are thus highly favorable to the production of a rich and varied flora, and yet we do not find so great a number of species, as, from the circumstances, we should have anticipated. The Cape of Good Hope resembles Palestine very closely in climate, geological and meteorological conditions, and also in geographical position; and yet the contrast between the vegetation of the two countries is very striking. The one represents the region of maximum, and the other the region of minimum species, under the Arctic and Antarctic circles, and outside the tropics. More plants are crowded together in the extreme south of Africa than in any other quarter of the world; while the flora of Great Britain, and of every other European country, is far more extensive, so far as we can judge from the materials before us, than that of Palestine, which seems to be richer in individuals than in species. Palestine has, perhaps, more social plants within the same area than any other country, and its individuals are generally exceedingly luxuriant, and cover large tracts of land with a uniform robe of vegetation. It has very few indigenous plants, the vast majority being derived from centers of distribution in the surrounding countries. Its peculiar geographical position exposed it to floral invasions from Europe and Asia, from Greece and the Isles of the Mediterranean, from Asia Minor, Egypt, Persia, Arabia, and India, and most of its plants have a wide range of dispersion over these countries. In general physiognomy, not, of course, in specific characters, the herbaceous plants and minor shrubs of the Holy Land make such an approximation to the flora of the cretaceous districts of England, and of those regions in the south of Europe where dolomite, or the Jurassic formation, prevails, as we should expect, from the similarity of their geological structure.

The eminent Danish botanist, Schouw, of Copenhagen, in an ingenious article in the Edinburgh *Journal of Science* for 1828, attempted to prove, from the simultaneous cultivation in Judea of the vine and the date-bearing palm, that the mean annual temperature of Palestine has not sensibly changed since the days of Moses, a conclusion which Principal Forbes also arrived at from slightly differerent premises, though in the same line of argument, in an ingenious paper in the *New Philosophical Journal* of April, 1862. But we venture to assert that, though the climate of the country may not have perceptibly changed as regards temperature, we have every reason to believe that its hygrometric condition has been considerably altered, and that it is now much drier than it formerly was. The Bible testifies that the country was once richly wooded and well watered, abounding in large forests of cedar, oak, pine, olive, and other trees. We read of the forest or wood of Ephraim; of the spacious forest of Hareth, in which David hid himself; of the forests of oak on the mountains of Bashan; of the cedar-forests of Lebanon; and the palm-groves of Jericho, according to Dr. Stanley, once eight miles long. But these have nearly all been cut down during the wars and political changes which have swept over the unhappy land for upward of two thousand years. The consequences of this disturbance of the equilibrium of nature are everywhere painfully apparent. Many of the herbaceous plants, which the forests nourished in their shade, deprived of their protection, have disappeared, and a hardier class have taken their place; springs and rivulets have been dried up, or been reduced to slender, inconstant threads; the soil has been deprived of its fertility, and is allowed to lie fallow; and districts once covered with waving harvests, rich vineyards, and olive groves, are now mere expanses of dust or naked rock, or arid, unsightly flats. A similar mournful change, produced by similar causes, has passed over nearly all the seats of ancient civilization, so that the glowing descriptions of their poets, historians, and geographers no longer apply to them. The vegetation of Greece, Italy, and Asia Minor, owing to the destruction of their primeval forests, and the consequent desiccation of their springs and streams, now approximates in its physiognomy to that of dry mountain regions, and is considerably different in character from what it was in former times. In Palestine, owing to this hygrometric change, several

plants, unknown in ancient times, and not mentioned in the sacred writings, have been introduced from other countries, and are now perfectly naturalized, occurring in great abundance at a distance from all human habitations. The *Cactus opuntia* is a striking example of the new flora. We have every reason to believe that this plant has been introduced since the dispersion of the Jews, but so exceedingly common is it now about Jerusalem, and in all waste, arid places throughout the country, that it has supplanted all native rivals, and forms the most conspicuous vegetation wherever it occurs. Thorny or spinous plants, the evidences of a degenerate flora and of deteriorated physical conditions, strike every traveler's eye as the preponderating forms of vegetation. They abound in every district, and frequently prove formidable barriers in traversing the country. Bonar and M'Cheyne mention, that for hours together, they traveled through fields of briers and thorns such as they saw in no other part of the world. The plains of Esdraelon, as well as the hills of Judah, are, in many places, covered with thickets of these dangerous plants, almost impenetrable to man or beast. Between Nazareth and Tiberias, Dr. Clarke found the soil so densely covered with various species of thistles, that a complete collection of them would be a valuable acquisition to botany. One of the most frequent and remarkable of these prickly plants is the Christ's thorn, or *Zizyphus Spina Christi*, well known to the modern Arabs under the name of *Nabka*. Its botanical appellation is derived from the tradition which identifies it with the plant of which the crown of thorns was made. Its appearance is very different from the conventional thorn with which the Italian painters have surrounded the brow of the Crucified One. The branches, according to Hasselquist, are long, slender, and pliable, so as to be easily plaited into any shape, while the leaves are like those of ivy, and are of a rich, glossy green, conveying, by its resemblance to the classic crown of victory, a covert insult, as well as producing pain. Nothing can be more treacherous than this innocent-looking shrub, whose beautiful verdure, contrasting with the desolation of the places in which it is found, the unsuspecting traveler greatly admires, for it conceals under every leaf a thorn often an inch in length, and curved like a fish-hook, which grasps and tears every thing that touches it—a far more formidable weapon than that of the "wait-a-bit thorn," so frequently alluded to in the

journals of South African travelers. It grows in great abundance on the hills of Jerusalem, as well as on the plains of Galilee. The caltrops (*Tribulus terrestris*), a kind of thistle, armed with long spines, found in Western Europe, and as troublesome as the military weapon of the same name formerly employed to impede the progress of cavalry, is exceedingly abundant on the barren soils of Palestine, and its thorny capsules often run into the feet of men and animals. This is the plant alluded to in Genesis iii: 18, under the name of דַּרְדַּר, dardar, and in Matt. vii: 16, and Heb. vi: 8, under the Greek term *τρίβολος*. The spiny rest-harrow (*Ononis spinosa*), differing slightly from the species which infests our own cultivated fields; the chedek (*Solanum spinosum*), a plant of the night-shade tribe, with dense spines on the stems and stocks of the leaves, and bearing a small round fruit, first green, then yellow, found also in the south of Europe; the *Paliurus aculeatus;* various species of *Rhamnus*, of the size of trees and shrubs; the azarole (*Cratægus azarolus*), a species of spiny hawthorn, growing on the hills; and the classical acanthus, whose leaves formed the archetype of the capital of the Corinthian pillar, and is generally understood to be the thorn of the New Testament—all these are very abundant in every part of the country, and give to the places where they occur a sad and dreary aspect. Palestine was famous of old for its spinous plants, Rabbinical writers asserting that there are no less than twenty-two different words signifying thorny and prickly plants in the Bible. The Hebrew words Koz, Choach, Naazuz, Shait, Shamir, Sillon, Sirim, Sirpad, Zinnim, etc., have been translated thorns and briers in the Old Testament, without distinction. Of late years the number of species has been greatly increased, owing to migrations from other lands, and even from Britain, and the old indigenous species have been more widely disseminated since the country was let out of cultivation. Travelers now call it "a land of thorns;" mournful proofs appearing on every side of the literal fulfillment of the prophecy, "Upon the land of my people shall come up thorns and briers, yea, upon all the houses of joy in the joyous city."

But though the aspect of the country in general is barren and desolate, it contains isolated spots of surprising beauty and fertility. Regions of the utmost luxuriance of vegetation not unfrequently alternate with regions of sublime barrenness. For

hours the traveler looks upon dreary mountains of limestone or basalt, whose fantastic heads glare or gloom in the intense blue sky, with a painful impression of weariness and lifelessness, dotted, if vegetation exist at all, with an occasional stunted juniper, or patches of a prickly paliurus or tribulus, fierce little plants, which despise soil and defy storms; and then, all at once, there gushes upon his bewildered sight a scene so strangely fair, so gloriously green and golden, that it seems as if a new and radiant world were mapped out before him. There can not be a greater contrast than between the northern and southern extremities of Palestine. The gorgeous beauty of the Ghutah or Plain of Damascus, the "eye of all the east," an island of glittering minarets, reposing under a transparent sky, amid an ocean of exquisitely blended foliage, combining the freshness of spring with the varied brilliance of autumn, has been often described with enthusiasm from the days of Isaiah to the present time. So, also, the calcareous slopes and wadies of the great Lebanon range, though shorn of much of their ancient glory, are remarkable for their verdure and beauty up to the very limits of everlasting snow. The voices of many waters, foaming over rocks, welling up the hillsides, rushing in torrents through the deep ravines, fill the air perpetually with a dreamy murmur, deliciously soothing in such a clime. Firs, brambles, oaks, junipers, fig-trees, and especially mulberries and vines flourish, with the utmost luxuriance: while the harvests of wheat, millet, barley, beans, etc., poured out almost spontaneously from the teeming lap of nature, may challenge comparison with those of the most fertile country in the world. The wine and the tobacco of Lebanon are prized above all others for their excellence. Three successive crops of potatoes may be obtained within the year from the same plot of ground. In the middle regions are large groves of olive-trees, producing fruit abundantly, and yielding the finest quality of oil. In the lower valleys, tropical fruits, such as pineapples and bananas, may be matured in three or four months, without any protection or artificial heat, by the mere effect of the climate. It is impossible to describe the beauty and richness of the wild-flowers which clothe the declivities and luxuriate in the balmy atmosphere, and under the bright, unclouded sunshine. In the pine forests on the outskirts of Beyrout, indeed everywhere around the base of Lebanon, the ground, in the spring of the year, can

not be seen for the flowers, most of which, in this country, are cultivated in gardens and greenhouses. Tulips, lupins, anemones, ranunculuses, sweet-peas, hyacinths, jonquils, and mignonette, of almost every color, form a variegated carpet, like the famous cloth of gold, far as the eye can see, and are common as daisies in an English meadow. The banks of every stream are adorned with the wild bouquets of variegated ladenes (cistus), and oleanders; almond-trees display above the verdure their rich crowns of pink-white blossoms in the cold days of January; sweet bays spread their fragrant evergreen foliage, as if in pity, over the ruins of forgotten towers and deserted wine-presses. The storax, or poplar of Scripture, puts forth its flowers, which resemble those of the German jasmine, in April, amid thickets of the graceful hadas or myrtle-tree, whose snow-white blossoms gleam out like stars from the glossy green foliage, and emit an exquisite perfume. The driest parts are adorned at certain seasons with the pink starwort, the rose-flowered onion, and a beautiful species of chrysantesema, everlasting, bell-flower, poppies, and gentians; while in the hottest season of the year, the caper-plant and the purple blossoms of the *Nigella Damascena*, or fennel-flower, still diversify the scene. The air, all the year round, smells as sweet as a well-stocked English greenhouse. This wave of luxuriance and beauty descends from the slopes of Lebanon, and covers a considerable portion of Galilee and the regions around the sources of the Jordan, disappearing southward amid the wild sterility of the Judean hills and the grim shores of the Dead Sea. The lakes of Merom and Tiberias are embosomed amid perennial verdure. The paths in this region are flanked on either side with gardens of mulberry and fig. Bay-trees, of great size, and diffusing a delightful balsamic odor, pomegranates, and medlars spring up spontaneously, and overarch the roads in many places with the richness of their foliage and the beauty of their bloom. When the soil is not deep enough for the growth of trees, innumerable bushes appear; the beautiful Eshel, or Oriental tamarisk, preserving the verdure of its mellow-like foliage in the most arid situations and in the greatest droughts; the box-tree, yielding the ashur wood of Tyrian commerce, exactly like the box of our gardens; and the cedrine juniper, replacing the heath of our own mountains, cover the calcareous hillsides; and even the barest and stoniest places are clothed with a rainbow robe of cyclamen,

iris, ranunculus, anemones, and lupins, of great size and dazzling brightness, not growing here and there in detached groups or in individual isolation, like the wild flowers which deck our woods and uplands, but in uniform masses, like annuals sown in a garden parterre. The richness of the effect in the transparent atmosphere and dazzling sunshine of Syria, requires to be seen in order to be fully appreciated. Those who have gazed upon the grassy carpet of Esdraelon, with its scarlet blaze of martagon lilies; upon the Sea of Galilee, with its luxuriant oleanders twining round it like a garland, and stretching out their fresh green leaves and rosy flowers to meet the blue wavelets on the shore; upon the lawns through which the sluggish waters of the Jordan flow, thickly fringed with the tall, wide-spreading sinapi or mustard-tree (*Salvadora Persica*), immortalized in the parable of our Savior; upon the richly-wooded slopes of Tabor; and upon the luxuriant growth and exhaustless abundance of the vegetation in the recesses of Carmel and on the borders of the deserts, where, to the very shore-line of the yellow, far-stretching sands, the acacia or shittah-tree maintains the contest of life with death, and decks the scene with the grace of its airy foliage and the beauty of its waving, yellow-haired blossoms—those who have seen these regions, all of them wholly uncultivated, and tenanted almost solely by the wandering Bedouin, must be convinced that, although a desolate, Palestine is not an exhausted land, and that although at present restrained by Providence from pouring out its teeming fruitfulness, it awaits only the advent of a more settled and industrious people, and the establishment of a more righteous and powerful government, to become once more what it used to be, "the heritage of God," "a land flowing with milk and honey," "a land of wheat and barley, and vines and fig-trees, and pomegranates."

There is no tree around which cluster so many solemn associations as the cedar of Lebanon. From our earliest years it has stood, in the midst of its wild mountain scenery, enthroned in our imaginations as our highest type and ideal of trees. To the Jews it was ever an object of intense interest and veneration. Each country has its one tree, which, from its predominance in the scenery, its own majesty or beauty, its useful qualities, or the memories connected with it, has come to be regarded as the national type of forest vegetation. Just as the oak is, *par excel-*

lence, the tree of England; the birch of Scotland; the pine of Norway; the olive of Italy; the orange of Spain; the date-palm of the East—so is the cedar of Lebanon pre-eminently the tree of Palestine. The inspired writers borrowed from its striking peculiarities some of their finest allusions and most magnificent descriptions; and the Psalmist carries the poetry associated with it to a climax, when he says, "The trees of the Lord are full of sap, the cedars which he hath planted." This does not appear the language of hyperbole, when we consider the majestic appearance of the cedar, its vast antiquity, the singular mode in which, in common with all coniferous trees, it propagates itself, and its extremely narrow range of distribution. It is confined exclusively to the moraines of extinct glaciers on the loftier ranges of Lebanon, below the level of perpetual snow, and is found nowhere else in the world. Though well adapted to a wide range of physical conditions, as is evinced by its luxuriant growth in this and other countries, where the hand of man has planted it from seeds obtained from the original trees, it has refused to spread itself naturally beyond the circumscribed circle of its native mountains. This is the single region, the center in which it was created, and to this point it has pertinaciously confined itself. The Hebrew name erez, which has been translated cedar, includes several other allied coniferious trees and shrubs. The cedar-wood mentioned in Leviticus must obviously have been obtained from some fragrant species of juniper growing plentifully in the crevices of the rocks of Sinai, as the cedar of Lebanon does not grow in the desert of Arabia, and the Israelites could have had no access to it in its native site. There are several species of cedar properly so called: the white cedar, which covers the famous cedar swamps of North America, and is in reality a cypress; and the red cedar of Virginia, of which lead pencils are formed, which is a juniper. Celsius quotes several authorities to prove that the species of Abies, called the cedar of Lebanon, was found in other places besides the Syrian range, as, for instance, in the coldest and loftiest mountains of Taurus, in Cilicia, and Galatia, and even in Cyprus and Siberia; but we have no hesitation in asserting that other closely allied species, whose range is more extensive, were, in these instances, confounded with it at a time when botanical characters were not so well understood as now, and that the true *Cedrus Libani* never grew anywhere else than on the mountain

range of which it once formed the crowning glory, and now constitutes the most interesting relic. The grandeur of the scene must have been unequaled when this tree formed one continued forest over the mountains, and blended its massive branches across the sparkling streams, its rich green, velvet-like foliage and gray trunks forming a fine contrast with the snowy summits, loading the whole atmosphere with its perennial fragrance. Whether the trees were thinned to exhaustion by the eighty thousand axes employed by Solomon, or whether they have decayed in consequence of some variation of climate, or other physical change in the country, it is impossible to say: but modern travelers inform us that the venerable remains of the cedars now occupy scarcely two acres of ground, and that the prophecy has been fulfilled in a remarkable manner. "The rest of the trees of his forest shall be few, that a child may write them." The whole of Lebanon does not now contain as many cedar-trees as are to be seen in the parks and lawns of England. The melancholy remains of the ancient forest are not scattered individually over the mountains, but form a small grove above the Maronite village of Bisherony, no other tree being visible for several miles. This grove is composed of several generations, all growing promiscuously together. Of the older dynasty, Warburton, Wilson, Lamartine, Lord Lindsay, and others, assert that there are only twelve now existing. The largest is sixty-three feet in circumference, following the sinuosities of the bark: while the whole of them are scarred with travelers' names. They are protected with great care, and are considered saints by the Maronites. Mass is performed annually, on the day of the feast of transfiguration, under their shadow, to which the inhabitants of the surrounding districts flock in crowds. The peasant looks upon the spot with a superstitious awe: he believes that God was the planter, and that He is still the guardian of the sacred grove. It is popularly believed that the trees can not be counted (and really, the discrepancies that exist in the accounts of various travelers would appear to give some shadow of truth to this belief), and that the sacrilegious pilgrim who seeks to carry away with him some withered branch, or broken stump, or cone, as a treasured memento of the spot, is visited with disease, and even death.

The palm-date תָּמָר, *tamar*, of Scripture, and the *Phœnix dactylifera* of botanists, was in ancient times so intimately asso-

ciated with Palestine, that coins belonging to the Roman occupation of Judea bear the effigy of a weeping female sitting beneath its shade. If we conclude from this circumstance that the date-palm was peculiarly characteristic of the Holy Land, our inference will be erroneous, for there is abundant evidence to prove that it never, even in the most favorable political periods, was very common in the country. It grew here and there in a few isolated spots, in groups, groves, or solitary trees; but its range was by no means continuous or extensive. Jericho is called "the city of palm-trees," but this name, as Kitto shrewdly remarks, could hardly have borne any distinctive value if the palm-tree had been as frequent in the Holy Land as it is in Arabia and Egypt. On this supposition, also, the names of Palmyra, Tadmor, Tamar, Hazezon-Tamar, and Baal-Tamar, given to certain cities in Syria and Palestine, would have no significance. Had it been exceedingly abundant in Palestine in ancient times, we should naturally expect to find more frequent mention made of it in the Bible than is the case. It is highly probable that the Romans engraved a palm on their coins, and gave the name of Phenicia, or land of palms, to the western coasts, because it was there they first beheld the tree growing in a wild or natural state. The locality of the date-palm is so peculiar that it can not, strictly speaking, be classed either with the trees of temperate or with those of tropical climates. It holds a certain intermediate position. It penetrates further north than any other species of palm, being cultivated in Spain, in the south of France, at Nice, and Rome, merely as an ornamental tree, or for the sake of its leaves, which are sold for use on Palm Sunday and at the Jewish Passover. In those places where the temperature is about 60°, it produces neither flowers nor fruit. At Palermo and Algiers, whose temperatures are about 63° 7′, it flowers luxuriantly, but it only ripens its fruit in peculiarly favorable seasons. The region best adapted to its growth is that belt of country where the mean annual temperature never falls below 68° 5′, extending, with few interruptions, from the shores of the Atlantic to the confines of Persia. In that thirsty land it grows abundantly, and matures its fruit every season; its verdant canopy, supported by naked upright stems like a graceful peristyle, forming a beautiful contrast with the red and arid sand of the desert. In most parts of this changeless region, the only objects which break the

monotony of the landscape are the date-palm and the tent of the Arab. It flourishes where none of the cerealia will grow, and in the interior of Barbary, in a great portion of Egypt, in the drier districts of Syria, and throughout Arabia, it is almost the only object of cultivation, and the sole means of subsistence to the people.

Though the palm-tree is capable of growing in every part of Palestine, it is only in certain localities, such as the coasts and inland valleys, that it produces or matures its fruit. Beyrout, which has a temperature of 69° 4′, a degree of Fahrenheit higher than that of Tunis, Jaffa, and Gaza, where the temperature is 70°; Jericho, and the valley of the Jordan, where the temperature is 72°, as high as that of Cairo; Engedi, one of the few fertile spots in the desolate region around the Dead Sea, with its tropical temperature, are all favorable to the perfect development of the date-palm. In the hill country of Judea, it puts forth flowers, but does not yield, or at least ripen, its fruit, unless in exceptional seasons. Palm-trees grew near Jerusalem, probably on the Mount of Olives, as we first find from Nehemiah and John; but though, as Principal Forbes remarks, used "to grace processions, there is no evidence of their being numerous, still less of their bearing fruit. It is remarkable that the references to the palm-tree in Scripture are almost exclusively confined to its stately and ornamental character, and rarely, if ever, to its fruit; the vine and fig being the favorite symbols of luxuriance in this respect. Indeed, it is more than doubtful whether the date-fruit is ever referred to in the Bible. The marginal reference to it in 2 Chron. xxxi: 5, as Professor Mitchell informs me, is by no means conclusive, and the derivation of the name *Bethany* may not be 'the house of dates,' as believed by some high authorities; and even if it be so, the word is regarded by Hebraists as signifying the fruit in a *green*, not in a ripe state, when it was used by the ancients as a condiment. It can not, therefore, be safely assumed that the date *ripened* at Bethany." The traveler now seldom beholds the palm in Palestine, and not a single specimen is to be seen, either in the Mount of Olives, or in the neighborhood of Jerusalem. Its disappearance from the valley of the Jordan, however, is due, not to the unfitness of the soil and climate to support it, but to the depopulation of the country, and to the rough treatment of the Arab tribes.

Associated with the cedar of Lebanon is the בְּרוֹשׁ, *berosh*, translated fir in different passages of Scripture, but, according to the almost universal opinion of botanists, more correctly rendered cypress. This coniferous tree does not exist in a wild state in Palestine, though it is one of the most characteristic of its plants. It is cultivated in gardens, cemeteries, and other open places of towns, rising high above the flat roofs, like dark Gothic spires, and giving to them a very picturesque appearance. The somber color of its ever-green foliage, passive under the light, still and motionless in a breeze, unchangeable in the passage of the seasons, caused it to be dedicated by the ancients to Pluto, and to be associated with funeral rites, and the silence and gloom of the grave. To this day the same idea prevails among the Mohammedans, and nothing can be more striking than the large collection of cypresses which surround Turkish minarets and burial-grounds, casting their long, dark shadows over the turbaned tombs. They are planted in such places, not only for ornament, but for utility, the aromatic odor which they exude being supposed to neutralize all noxious exhalations. A black belt, composed of hundreds of thousands of cypresses, girdles Constantinople from the Sea of Marmora and the Seven Towers to the Blanchernæ Palace and the Golden Horn, looking like a vast funeral procession, and imparting a sadness to the landscape that would be oppressive, were it not for the brilliant sunshine and the perpetual smile of the sea and sky. These solemn cypress forests, on the European and Asiatic shores of the Sea of Marmora, in whose shade the dove utters its plaintive coo all day long, owe their origin to a beautiful custom once prevalent among the Moslems. Whenever a child was born, the parents planted a cypress; and when either of the parents died, another tree was planted by the surviving children at the head of the grave. "It must have been an improving occupation for the serious moments to have gone to look at one's birthday tree, and to have marked its green spire rising up, and its husky rind swelling out, reminding the Turk of time's flight, and of the summers that form our lives, which time plucks one by one, as an idler does the red leaves of the rose he has grown tired of; it would grow and become a home for doves, and a stiff harp-string for the breezes of the Bosphorus; and it would grow gold and ruby in daily sunsets, and a silver column, like a frozen fountain, in nightly moonshine; and then, when the birthday tree had

distanced its human rival in the life-race, and gray hairs and infirm limbs had come to the old man, there would be the cypress still green, fresh, and unscarred, waiting patiently till the grave should open, and that other tree, its young companion so long waited for, should come to rise beside it, perhaps to outlive its predecessor, and triumph in its turn over death and decay." No burial or birth-trees are now planted around Stamboul; but the forests reproduce themselves, and they spread wider and wider year after year.

Though lying considerably south of the zone of coniferous trees, there are several species found in the Holy Land, as the Aleppo pine, the oriental and Corsican pine, and the *Pinus pinea* or stone pine, to which allusion is made by Hosea, "I am like a green fir-tree, in me is thy fruit found," this species producing an edible nut, often used by confectioners. It is probable that the cypress of the sacred writers included, not only that tree, but also the juniper, several kinds of which grew in Palestine, as the common savine, the Phœnician, and prickly junipers, which are ever-green shrubs, attaining a hight of ten or twelve feet, and employed by the Jews for building and ornamental purposes. The word tirzah, translated cypress, in Isa. xliv: 14, is supposed by many to mean the Ilex or ever-green oak, one of the commonest trees in the south of Europe, and forming in some parts of Palestine, as the hills of Hebron, considerable forests. Its wood was constantly employed by the ancients in making images. The celebrated oak of Bashan and Gilead is the Valonia oak (*Quercus Aegilops*), distinguished by its curious, large, prickly acorn-cups, employed in this country for dyeing. It is very common on the hills of Judah, as are also the Montpellier oak, and the Kermes oak, which last is a low, bushy evergreen, and furnishes for the kermes insect, formerly used to dye scarlet. The Gophir wood, of which the ark was constructed, is supposed to be the produce of the cypress, for it is exceedingly abundant throughout the region in which it was built, whereas other kinds of wood are scarce. Its refuse branches and timber could easily be converted into tar, with which to pitch the sides of the ark; and its wood, while straight and easily worked, is also hard, compact, and indestructible, the mummy cases of the ancient Egyptians having been composed of it, and the cypress doors of St. Peter's at Rome have now remained undecayed upward of a thousand years.

The commonest tree in Palestine is the sycamore, Shikmim (Sycomorus antiquorum), a species of fig-tree, belonging to the bread-fruit order, and distinguished by its twisted and gnarled branches, the milky juice that exudes from it when pierced, and its singular edible fruit growing in clusters, not from the ends of twigs, but on the trunk and main branches. It is a lofty and wide-spreading tree, and is frequently planted for its shade along the waysides, though it is not much valued either for its timber or its fruit. It is confined entirely to the plains and valleys, being incapable of enduring the colder climate and occasional frosts of the mountainous regions. A more striking and picturesque object in the landscape, though less common, is the terebinth or teil tree, (Pistachia terebinthus). In consequence of its great longevity, and the enormous size which it often attains, it was employed in ancient times as a landmark, to designate the places where important events occurred. It was in the valley of Elah, or the terebinth valley, that David slew Goliath; and Abraham pitched his tent under its shadow in Mamre, which Dr. Robinson supposes to lie on the road between Jerusalem and Gaza, and, by a singular coincidence, he there found the largest terebinth he had seen in the Holy Land. The trees of righteousness, to which Isaiah alludes, were terebinths. The terebinth is a deciduous tree, about twenty feet high, with small, feathered leaves, lancet-shaped, and large, branched clusters of purple fruit, like cherries. In the low grounds, where the soil is rich and humid, the beautiful plane-tree (Platanus orientalis) grows very luxuriantly, though by no means common, affording, by its wide-spreading branches, covered with glossy palmate leaves, a welcome shelter from the scorching rays of the sun. Its Hebrew name, Armon, has been translated, in our version, chestnut; a tree unknown in Palestine. The armon is associated, in Genesis, with willows and poplars, which are found in low, moist situations, whereas the chestnut is never found except on dry, mountain slopes. The plane was considered a sacred tree by the ancients; the academic groves of Greece were composed of it, and Xerxes is said to have stayed his march in order to pay divine honors to a large specimen in Lydia. Of the willow tribe, two species are mentioned in the Bible, under the names of Oreb and Orebim, and Zaphzapha. The former term refers to the Babylonian or weeping willow, whose long, penulous tresses form one of the

fairest features of river scenery; the latter refers to the Egyptian willow, the *saf-saf* of the Arabs, distinguished by its flexible twigs, of a pale yellow color, its broad leaves and fragrant catkins. The aspen, or trembling poplar, whose leaves are moved by the slightest zephyr, is found associated with willows and oaks overshadowing the streams of lower Lebanon and the ravines of Southern Palestine. The Hebrew word *Becaim*, translated mulberry-tree, is supposed to mean this species, and its singular form, Baca, gave its name to the valley of weeping, in the 84th Psalm, owing to the abundance of aspens beside its pools and watercourses. The range of this tree is remarkably extensive, occurring in mountain glens all over the East, as well as in the sub-Alpine districts of Scotland, where the tradition exists among the peasantry that it formed the wood of which the cross of Christ was composed, and that its leaves have ever since shivered with guilty consciousness.

There is a great variety of trees cultivated in Palestine on account of their fruit, for which the soil and climate are admirably adapted. Their prototypes are found in a wild state in the country as part of its indigenous vegetation; but the great majority of individuals have been taken under the protection of man. Fig-trees abound in every suitable locality, often forming large plantations. Pomegranates clothe valleys with their dark-green, myrtle-like foliage, spangled with the lovely crimson blossoms and the equally lovely fruit. The olive still lingers in many a hallowed spot; several magnificent trees growing in the garden of Gethsemane, whose vast bulk and aged appearance render it probable that they may have been there in the time of our Savior; "Old witnesses," as Lamartine says, "written of on earth and in heaven, watered by divine tears, by sweat of blood, and so many other tears shed since that night which rendered them forever sacred." The sycamine, or black-mulberry, is very common in Palestine, and extensively cultivated by the Druses on Mount Lebanon, not for the sake of its bramble-like fruit, although it yields a grateful sherbet, but for the sake of its leaves, which form the food of the silk-worm. The wild mulberry, whose leaves are very tender and succulent, is grafted on the stock of the Persian mulberry, and is thus rendered hardier, as well as develops a more luxuriant foliage. Groves of carob-trees (*Ceratonia siliqua*) are very frequent by the waysides, and yield a profuse

supply of *κεράτια* or husks, used at the present day, as of old, for feeding swine and cattle. It is sometimes called the locust-tree, and St. John's bread, from a mistaken notion that the pods were the locusts on which the Baptist fed in the wilderness. In general appearance it resembles an apple-tree, with rich and evergreen foliage. Apple-trees, by the way, are rare in Syria, and the fruit they produce is very small and ill-flavored. The *tappuach* of Scripture is manifestly not the apple but the citron or some other member of the orange family; the rich golden color of its fruit, the fragrance of its blossoms, and the beautiful appearance of its trunk and foliage, are particularly suited to all the passages in which the term occurs. The vine was eminently the peculiar symbol of Judea, being engraved on the coins of the Maccabees; and at Hebron, near which was the celebrated Eshcol, according to Jewish tradition, was its original center of distribution. Vineyards abounded in Canaan when the Israelites took possession of it, and the vines attained extraordinary perfection, and were exceedingly productive. The vine does not endure a tropical climate, ceasing to flourish productively whenever the mean temperature of the year approaches 22° centigrade, or 71° 6′ Fahrenheit. In Asia, Africa, and Europe, it has never been cultivated with the view of converting its fruit into wine, outside the zone comprised between the thirtieth and fiftieth degrees of north latitude. In the warm climate of the valley of the Jordan it was rare, if not unknown; and it appears to have been unproductive on the lowlands adjoining the Mediterranean. This is the testimony of Scripture upon the subject, and it has been corroborated by the accounts of all travelers. Spots that were favorable for the perfect development of the palm, were unfavorable to the vine. It might therefore be expected to flourish on the mountains of Judea, and to fail on the plains of Jericho. The region of Palestine is almost or quite the farthest south in the particular quarter of the globe where the vine is luxuriant and productive, the elevation of the hills and table-lands of Judah being its true climate. We read, indeed, in the Old Testament, that the vine was used for vintaging purposes in Egypt, and numerous hieroglyphics attest that this was not an exceptional, but a common practice. The wine of Antilla, grown near Alexandria, was the choicest seen at the banquets of Antony and Cleopatra. But, in that country the wine was grown only in the north, and

in places exceptionally cool and moist, where, by sheltering it from the rays of the sun, and other precautions, the injurious influence of climate was prevented. At Cairo, with a mean temperature of 72°, the culture is insignificant. Very few vineyards are now to be seen in Palestine and Egypt, owing to the want of energy in the people, and to unfavorable political and religious causes. In the Lebanon, however, they are almost as numerous as ever, and the wine produced from them has been famous from the earliest ages. It was much sought after by the Roman epicures: and, indeed, some of its wines to this day can hardly be surpassed for richness of color and delicacy of flavor. Upward of thirty different varieties of vines flourish on these mountains, while the rocky nature of the soil and the extreme purity and balminess of the atmosphere bring them all to a perfection not attainable in the south of Europe.

Of herbaceous plants, distinctively beautiful, there are several striking examples in Palestine. The plains of Galilee are clothed with the radiant loveliness of the lily, which grows there in myriads in the month of January. The traveler, as already observed, is struck with the amazing variety and luxuriance of liliaceous plants in the north of Palestine. Any one of these might have been the species from which the Savior taught an instructive lesson to his disciples—for Solomon, in all his glory, is not arrayed like the least lovely of them. But most botanists are of opinion that the Martagon or Chalcedonian lily, formerly called the lily of Byzantium, was the species referred to by the word κρίνον. It is frequently cultivated in gardens in this country under the name of Turk's turban, on account of its brilliant scarlet flowers. The white lily, usually regarded as an emblem of spotless purity and innocence, is unknown in Palestine in the wild state, being occasionally cultivated on the roofs of houses and in gardens in Syria. We do not agree with Dr. Kitto in referring the lily of the Old and New Testament to the same species. The word shushan שׁוּשַׁן, translated lily in Canticles, is, we believe with Dr. Royle, the famous blue nymphæa or lotus of the Nile. The allusion to its economic properties as "feeding among the lilies," renders this a plausible supposition, its seeds being a common article of Egyptian diet. The lily-work with which the carved capitals of Solomon's temple were adorned was evidently composed of the lotus leaf and flower, the charac-

teristic ornament of Egyptian architecture. The lotus was once very abundant in the waters of the Nile, but since the sacred river has been opened up to commerce, it has disappeared, along with the equally famous bulrush or papyrus, except in a very few remote localities.

It is almost impossible to identify the rose of Scripture by its proper botanical appellation. By Celsius it is understood to mean the oriental narcissus, which is abundant on the plains of Sharon, and is very highly prized by the natives of the East on account of its great beauty; and its combination with the lily in Canticles seems to favor this supposition, as well as the fact that the word in the original implies the idea of a plant growing from a bulb. Most authors agree, at least, that the rose is not the chabazzaleth of Scripture. No species of rose is found at the present day in the plains of Sharon. The only plant that could be mistaken for it, growing there, is the rose-flowering cistus; but, though its blossom in shape and hue somewhat resembles that of the wild brier, it is an herbaceous plant. Wild roses, though most abundant in many parts of the East, and especially in Persia, where it is, as in England, the national flower, are far from common in Palestine, owing to some peculiarity in the soil and climate unfavorable to their growth; and those species which do occur, at rare intervals, are very inferior to those of this country, with the exception of the damask rose, peculiar to Syria. Dr. Royle suggests that the rose-laurel, or oleander, is most probably the flower indicated in the Bible. If this be actually the rose of Scripture, it is a matter of astonishment that reference is made to it only in two places. It is one of the most characteristic plants of the Holy Land, being mentioned by every traveler in glowing terms as one of the greatest ornaments of the scenery. Along the borders of almost every stream or collection of water, it forms dense thickets; and, when in full bloom, its thickly clustered, rose-like blossoms rising above its varnished dark-green leaves, it presents a spectacle equaled, but not surpassed, by the famous rhododendron thickets of the Sikkim Himalayas. There is a strange plant, called the rose of Jericho, which deserves more than a passing notice. It is often confounded with a species of Cape mesembryanthemum, whose fruit vessel closes when dry, and opens when placed in water. The true rose of Jericho, or anastatica, grows in the bleakest and most

desert spots in the south of Palestine, to which its structure and peculiarities are admirably adapted. It is supposed to be the plant עֲרֹעֵר (ar-ar) translated by many juniper, tamarisk, tamarind, retana, or broom, to which the prophet Jeremiah alludes, "Flee, and be like the heath in the wilderness." There is no heather in Palestine, and, thus interpreted, we think the appropriateness of the simile is destroyed. Applied to the anastatica, on the other hand, it is exceedingly striking and beautiful; for this plant, at certain seasons of the year, when the moisture of its native spot has dried up, loosens its hold of the soil, curls itself up into a ball, and is blown by the winds to a locality favorable for its growth, where it takes root, expands its flowers, and brings forth its fruit, to repeat this nomadic life when circumstances again necessitate it. In this respect it resembles several species of lycopodium, or club-moss, found in Mexico and Brazil, which are often brought to this country and preserved by the curious, who think them still alive because they expand when placed in water. The anastatica has no botanical affinity whatever to the heath tribe, and yet it bears a superficial resemblance to a sprig of withered ling denuded of its leaves, a large patch of it looking, at a distance, not unlike a plot of heather on the hill-side, which had been burned and whose stumps had been bleached by the weather. Of course our translators, in rendering the term *ar-ar* by heath, seem to have been guided by what appeared to them to be the most likely plant of desolate places; though, in this instance, their guess has been far wider of the mark than it usually is.

Besides the indigenous vegetation of Palestine, there is occasional mention made in the sacred writing of plants, or rather of their produce, for which the Jews were indebted to their commerce with the Arabs of the coast, who obtained them from India, and other countries of the East, by way of the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf. In this way ebony was procured from Ethiopia; cinnamon from Ceylon; cassia—another species of cinnamon—from the Malabar coast; coriander from Persia and Egypt; algum or almug trees—supposed to be the sandal-wood, the produce of a low tree resembling the privet, remarkable for the fragrance of the central parts of the stem near the root, and brought from Ophir, probably some part of India, where it is found in great abundance at the present day; aloes, or lign aloes, (*ahalium*),

the fragrant resinous substance exuded from the trunk of the *Aquilaria agallochum*—a tree common in various parts of Eastern Asia; myrrh, the resinous gum of a small odoriferous tree growing in Abyssinia and Arabia Felix, celebrated as a perfume and stimulating medicine, and often given as a present by the ancients, on account of its value and rarity; thyme-wood, mentioned in Revelations as one of the articles of merchandise in the apocalyptic Babylon, and supposed to be the *Callitris quadrivalvis*, a species of thuya or cypress growing on Mount Atlas, and other hills in the north-east of Africa, and yielding the inflammable and acrid resin called gum-sandarach; the precious spikenard, a fragrant essence or unguent, prepared from a species of valerian known to botanists as the *Nardostachys Jatamansi*, which grows on the elevated and dry pastures of northern India; and the sweet cane from a far country, which may possibly be not the aromatic calamus of India, but the sugar-cane which came originally from China and the East, though now growing almost exclusively in the western hemisphere: all these valuable woods and spices were the products of those regular commercial journeys which extended three thousand miles or more, and required the space of three years for their accomplishment, going and returning.

There are very few cryptogamic plants in Palestine. The climate is too dry, and the luxuriance of higher types too rich, to allow of a great variety of humble tribes of vegetation to appear. The proportion which the flowerless plants bear to the flowering is, we believe, not ten in a hundred. The arid mountainous regions in the south, on which the sun beats down with unmitigated light and heat, are destitute of that beautiful cryptogamic covering which gives such a rich effect to our mountain regions; the trunks of the trees are generally bare and free from mosses and lichens, while the ruins scattered over the face of the country have no drapery of beauty, no hoary hues, to soften their harsh and rugged aspect, and harmonize them with the rich colors and soft forms of the scenery around. The Valonian oak is the only tree whose trunk is shaggy with lichens, from which circumstance it is commonly called "goat's-beard oak;" and on the shadier parts of the walls of Jerusalem grows a species of moss called *Gymnostomum fasciculare*, common, also, on banks in the country, which Hasselquist supposed to be the hyssop of Sol-

omon. In the Lebanon range, also, many a cool fountain is fringed with the delicate filigree leaves of the *Adiantum capillus veneris*, or maiden-hair fern; and its brink carpeted with rich, green cushions of mosses, jongermanniæ, and various other representatives of that tiny vegetable world, whose strange, antique forms and marvelous structures afford an unwearied study to every lover of nature. Such spots, in a glaring country like Palestine, are more lovely and refreshing than even palm or olive groves, or fields blazing with the rainbow hues of narcissuses and daffodils. There is no express mention made of any cryptogamic plant in the Bible. We have, however, indirect evidence that the lower orders of fungi were fully more numerous and destructive in Bible times than they are at the present day. The mildew, which committed such dreadful ravages in the barley, wheat, and millet fields, and often reduced the people to the extremity of famine, was never once suspected to be of vegetable origin—different species of parasitic fungi, of the *Uredo* and *Puccinia* families—but was looked upon entirely as a meteorological product, or as a peculiar form of pestilence sent directly from the hand of God. It was far more frequent in their fields than we should have expected from the dryness of the climate and the brilliancy of the sunshine, showing that these advantages must have been more than neutralized by a wretched system of agriculture. The leprosy of the house and of garments was another occult phenomenon, which almost every commentator has persisted in misunderstanding, though its vegetable character appears as clear as daylight from the graphic description given of it in Exodus. It is evident that the language of Moses is popular, not scientific; and may, therefore, be supposed to include several agencies as concerned in the production of these two kinds of leprosy, distinct in themselves, but giving rise to somewhat similar appearances. The different colors of the plague clearly indicate this. The reddish patches may have been caused by a species of fungus called dry-rot, (*Merulius lachrymans*), which appears at first in the floors and beams of buildings, in the form of round, white, cottony patches, from one to eight inches broad, afterward developing over their whole surface a number of fine orange or reddish-brown irregular folds, distilling drops of moisture when perfect, hence the specific name. This insidious disease, once established, spreads with amazing rapidity, destroying

the most solid houses in a few years. So virulent is its nature, that it extends from the wood-work of a house even to the walls themselves, and by penetrating their interstices, crumbles them to pieces. The houses of Palestine, built, for the most part of mud or wood, were peculiarly exposed to its ravages; and when once this fungus obtained a footing, the desperate remedy proposed by Moses had often to be resorted to after the failure of every attempt to extirpate it. The green patches on garments and on the walls of houses may have been caused by a species of mold, a fungus much lower in the scale of organization than the other, and much simpler in construction. It is the most protean of all plants, assuming different forms on different substances, but familiar to us in the light, fleecy covering which it spreads over old shoes, stale pieces of bread, or cast-off clothes left in damp and ill-ventilated places. The red leprosy of garments has played a somewhat remarkable part in history. It was very common in the middle ages, occurring often before the outbreak of epidemics, which it was supposed to herald; appearing suddenly on the sacramental host, and the vestments of priests, and was regarded with superstitious fear, as a *signaculum*, or omen of gloomy presage. The researches of microscopists have dispelled the mystery and terror which surrounded it for so many ages, and resolved it into a collection of minute and simple fungi.

Our fast lessening space warns us to conclude. We might have examined in detail the mass of facts and arguments accumulated in the identification of such extremely doubtful plants as the hyssop, Jonah's gourd, and the gourd of the prophets. These plants have been the subject of keen and violent controversy among commentators since the days of the fathers; but, as we are not possessed of any new information regarding them, we must leave the matter as Royle has settled it. We have omitted altogether many plants deserving of special mention, and briefly alluded to others that might have furnished materials for whole paragraphs; for a subject like this, to do it ample justice, would require, not a magazine article, but a large volume. The necessity of brevity has also compelled us to leave untouched the Hebrew classification of plants, and those questions regarding the origin and distribution of species which are suggested by the first chapter of Genesis, and there more satisfactorily settled

in one or two brief sentences than by all the elaborate treatises of the Darwinian school of science. We close our brief and rapid survey of the Flora of Palestine with a mingled feeling of pleasure and dissatisfaction. While much has been done, much more remains still to do. And, in an age of universal research like this, when the earth, the air, and the waters have been compelled to give up their buried secrets to a persevering curiosity, which nothing can repress, we may surely hope for clearer light regarding those vegetable productions which have this interest superadded to them above all others, that not only did the hand of God create them in the consecrated soil of the Holy Land, but his Spirit transplanted them into the sacred inclosure of his Holy Word, there to bloom in amaranthine freshness, till the fair face of nature itself vanishes away, and the written oracles shall give place to the living Presence and the living Voice.

REV. CHARLES SIMEON, AND THE SECRET OF HIS SUCCESS.*

The opinion which the present generation appear to have formed of the venerable Simeon is, that he was a good man, of many oddities and an overweening vanity. Had they known him such as he really was, they would confess that the outline is too extravagant, even for a caricature. He had many opponents still, though an old man—we speak of the years from 1823 to 1833—and they spoke their minds freely, as young men are used to do, especially in our universities. We have heard a pleasant variety of hard names applied to him and to his disciples, but we can not recollect that eccentricity and variety were among the number. He was, of course, a Methodist, a saint, and very likely a dissenter; at least, he was the leader of the Simeonites, and, therefore, something discreditable lay buried somewhere underneath, though it seemed to us that none of our younger acquaintance had discovered exactly where it lay, or what it really was; and the seniors, we thought, were not much better informed. Of course, they used politer language, and shut us up when we asked

---

* From the *Christian Observer*, February, 1863.

for information, by hinting significantly that Simeon was a Calvinist. But, whatever truth there may have been in any one or all of these charges, old Simeon, it was allowed, was at least a gentleman. In truth, there was no resident member of the university of our time who carried with him so much of the air of a perfectly well-bred English gentleman. His figure, without being tall, was commanding, his carriage erect and graceful, his manner courteous, his dress that which became a clergyman of wealth and some distinction, with no remarkable peculiarities, unless a head slightly powdered, a shovel-hat, and an excellent silk gown are entitled to that distinction. You might have known him long without discovering that he had any other peculiarities than such as every man of strong natural character, especially if he has lived much alone, contracts on his passage through life. We could mention, without stopping to consider, at least half a dozen old college tutors, professors, and heads of houses of that day, who, compared with him, were eccentricity itself. His gait was slow and dignified, for he was growing old; but there was nothing in it of affectation. His features were good, and he may once have been—and from the portrait in Canon Carus's volume we infer that he once was—what is thought a handsome man: of this the traces remained in a large, gray eye full of expression, and a broad forehead. His complexion was dark enough to give some color to the story, current among undergraduates, that he was of Jewish origin. Such was Simeon as we remember him; for he was one of those men whose figure imprints itself at once upon the mind, and is never afterward disturbed.

As to mental infirmities, he had, no doubt, his share. He was naturally irritable, as he himself tells us; and possibly a tinge of clerical pedantry might cling to him. But of all this the traces only remained in the years of which we speak. His irritability had not degenerated into peevishness. His was a calm and happy old age, full of fire, fuller still of love. His vanity we should have known only from his own confessions, were it not for a few childish instances, which now and then broke out in trifling matters, and which have been related so often by his friends, as to have been taken at length for the basis of his character. But, in short, Henry Martyn, Thomason, Professor Scholefield, and Francis Goode were his curates in succession.

One and all of them revered the man. They loved him, and delighted to speak of him as their friend and father, and had for him, while he lived, a respect, mingled with an affection, such as no parent ever received from so many distinguished men; and a weak, vain man, if he lived to be a Methusalah, would never win such love and reverence as this.

Let us speak of him as a minister of Christ, and chiefly as a preacher; for it was in the pulpit that he was most known, and there it was that his strength lay, and that his triumphs for his Master were achieved.

He was not, in any sense, an eloquent man. Except a commanding person, he had scarcely one natural qualification for an orator. His voice was thin and poor; though, toward the conclusion of some of his sermons, it rose occasionally to that kind of solemn grandeur which intense earnestness conveys, and he held it in perfect control. Nothing ever induced him either to shout or scream. But he was not even fluent. He never seemed hurried or embarrassed, but he constantly hesitated. The proper word, it was evident, would not come, and he was waiting for it. Deep student of his Bible as he was, he had no readiness in quoting even ordinary texts. He carried his Bible under his arm into the pulpit, and preached either from a few notes, or from none at all. His Bible had a number of silken strings, corresponding to the hues of the rainbow, and of the same gradations of color, so that when he had referred to one text, he knew by the color of the string which quotation came next in order; but he never seemed to trust himself beyond his previous preparation. We infer that the inventive genius was not his in any eminent degree. His powers of combination and analysis were not great; nor had he that brilliant imagination which might have covered the defect, and which, with a captivating voice and a fluent tongue, explains the sudden popularity of many a young minister, as well as its rapid decay. He seldom gave a striking illustration, and when he did, you felt that it had been prepared beforehand. Neither did he possess that profound acquaintance with human nature which often attends great spirituality of mind and much intercourse with men, even where there is neither taste nor talent for metaphysical pursuits, nor time for study. He seldom, to use Cecil's words, "darted upon you with an unexpected stroke." His preaching was too general to be very effective when the

mind was deeply exercised with some special tribulation of its own. He never grappled with the deeper difficulties of thoughtful men; he did not seem to be aware of their existence. He spoke to the multitude, and the multitude, even in a university, let it be said without offense, are not thoughtful men. Besides, he never forgot the claims which his own parishioners had upon him, and these were of the middle class, with a large number of poor people crowding in the aisles. Sometimes, it is true, he made a powerful impression by a single blow. Thus on a text, which, no doubt, he had often heard repeated at the college-table and elsewhere, where the Bible was not often quoted, "Be not righteous overmuch," he begins thus: "This is the sheet-anchor of ungodly men." Had he spoken for an hour in his happiest mood, he would not have made a deeper impression. After explaining the text, he closes with certain admonitions, which may have created a smile at the moment, but would not soon be forgotten. He cautions his hearers to be *wisely righteous*, to be *truly righteous*, and to take care that, at the last great day, they shall be found to have been *righteous enough!*

To what, then, are we to ascribe his great success? To several causes, we reply, which deserve to be considered.

The first, of course, is, that he proclaimed "the glorious Gospel of the blessed God." This was his theme in his own parish church, and from this text we heard him deliver a course of sermons admirable for simplicity, strength, and truth, from the university pulpit. In his ministry Christ was all and in all. Men, it seems, have begun, now that he has been dead nearly thirty years, to raise a question as to the doctrines he taught, or, which is the same thing in effect, as to the party to which he belonged. There were no such questions then. With Church politics he neither troubled himself nor others. In every thing important he clung to the rubric, where its directions were clear. In things indifferent he maintained his liberty, or followed common usage. He sung hymns out of a hymn-book which he had himself compiled, and was a Low Churchman. He put on the surplice and read, or, as he was fond of saying, prayed the prayers with a fervor and an effect to which no ultra Churchman we ever listened to has ever made the slightest approximation. But in the pulpit he literally seemed to know nothing but Jesus Christ and him crucified. He had but one topic, but it was never threadbare.

He played upon an instrument of one string, but in his hands it was never monotonous. He was not profound; he was not critical; he was not in a high degree experimental, but there was grandeur in his very earnestness, and in rebuking sin, especially the sins of youth and of undergraduates, a solemnity that was sometimes awful. In uttering the invitations of Christ, there was in the same way a tenderness that was inexpressible. Men far his superiors in mental powers and every scholastic attainment must have felt as if some loving child had seized them by the hand, and implored them with tears, as they were buried in sleep or immersed in study, to escape for their lives from a roof already crashing amid an ocean of devouring flames.

This was the great secret. Next in order, though at a vast distance, we place his sobriety of mind. He had no crotchets. If there was any thing about him which justly deserves to be called eccentric, it was in his manner, never in his matter. He had too much gesticulation in prayer for an English audience, and his action, which seemed involuntary, was by no means good. This sometimes gave offense to strangers, in an age when it was a misdemeanor to be too much in earnest, and it sometimes prejudiced persons of good taste, who were impatient and of irritable nerves. We can understand the feelings of the children, brought most likely from a country parsonage, and acquainted only with the smooth tones and perfectly correct delivery of their own father, when, as Mr. Brown tells us, they inquired why the gentleman was in a passion. The anecdote was not worth relating. Similar remarks, from those who have not the excuse of childhood, may be heard every week in every parish where an earnest ministry succeeds a lifeless one. But, beyond this, Simeon's ministry had no offensive peculiarities. He had no hobby, unless it were the conversion of the Jews. He rode this well, but only once a term, when he drew (and, we must own, with a facility which was often inconvenient in its consequences) the half crowns from the pockets of undergraduates, or shillings which could be worse spared, if he postponed his collections till the vacation was at hand. His subjects in the pulpit were always those of general interest; they concerned the whole of his flock. And there were few of them which did not reach the hearts both of saints and sinners, though, as we have said, deeply-thinking men often felt he had not gone down with them into the depth either of their

intellectual difficulties or their spiritual trials. But, whatever the text, the sermon was always practical. Had he been the vain-glorious man he is sometimes represented, he would surely have displayed his natural character in the pulpit. The length of his sermons would have let out the secret of his self-importance, but he was never long; or he would have spoken often of himself, but self was never mentioned. In a university town he would have affected scholarship; and he was a fair critic, and a very well-read divine, but criticism was seldom introduced, and then with no parade; and the books of learned men were never mentioned. All these were points on which, it now seems to us, after the interval of many years, that his good sense and his solidity of judgment were admirable. The temptations to transgress were strong, stronger still the grace and wisdom which enabled him to resist them. The triumph was so complete that, to his hearers, there seemed to have been no contest, for no traces of the war remained.

No one man, in the present century, has done so much as he to raise the standard of piety in the Church of England. The age does not admit of a Wyckliffe or a Luther. One mind can not now penetrate and remold a nation. The wind that blows upon the slain comes, as aforetime, from the four corners of the earth; for the dry bones whiten on the open plain, and God employs various influences to co-operate at once upon them, and accomplish his gracious purposes—sanctified science, experience gathered from every source, numberless books, as well as the voice of the living preacher. But to Charles Simeon belongs the honor of having, whether from the extent of his usefulness, the depth of his piety, or the Scriptural simplicity of his doctrine, been one of the most distinguished ministers the Church of Christ has been favored with in England since the days of the Reformation. He was placed by Him who holdeth the stars in his right hand in a position which, probably, no other man could have filled so well; he consecrated all his powers to the service of his Lord, and became a burning and a shining light among us. And not to him or to his memory, so much as to his Lord and ours, would we inscribe this passing tribute of his eminent worth and faithful service.

THE IMPRECATORY PSALMS.*

WHAT are called the Imprecatory Psalms have been charged with expressing feelings of vindictiveness altogether at variance with the spirit of the Gospel. This charge, of course, involves the character of the psalmists, and has been used to disparage the real worth of their religious affections and attainments; and, consequently, affects painfully the feelings of those who are bound to the psalmists by those ties of brotherhood which connect with one another believers of all ages. Fortunately, however, so far as the psalmists are known to us, their character will not bear the stain. David, who alone is really put on his trial by this charge, was a man capable, certainly, as all men are, of occasional acts of cruelty on sudden and strong temptation; but incapable of cherishing deliberately cruel designs, and much more incapable of deliberately publishing relentless passions.

If there be any truth in psychology, if there be any laws regulating the development and consistency of character, we argue—not from the fact of his being a good man, but from the whole build of his moral constitution—that any psalm written by David must be misinterpreted, if it seems to breathe mere cruelty and vindictiveness. If nothing more was involved, however, than the character of David, the discussion would have comparatively little importance. We might have to adopt a new reading of his character, allowing it greater compass, and regarding it as a more striking instance than we had previously supposed of the inconsistency by which, unfortunately, even good men are characterized.

But the charge against the Imprecatory Psalms has been pressed for the purpose of disparaging the Scriptures as a whole, and overthrowing their claim to any thing worthy of being called inspiration. If these psalms do really breathe such cruelty and vindictiveness, if they are really at variance with the spirit of the Gospel, then the verbal and even the plenary inspiration of Scripture can no longer be maintained. Nay, more; not only must we, in accordance with the clamors of so many writers of

* From the *British and Foreign Evangelical Review*, July, 1864.

the present day, withdraw our confidence from all such Scriptural statements as refer to matters of science and history, but we must abandon Scripture as an authority, and even as a trustworthy guide, in its own special region of moral and spiritual truth. This being evident, the case against these psalms has been urged to an extremity. Many would, apparently, have us regard them as singular in all literature for the rigor of pitiless wrath; while it must be allowed that too many of the pleas advanced in their defense have been such as still more to disturb those friends of revealed truth who were already perplexed by the subject, and to afford to the adversary still more plausible grounds to impugn the morality of the psalms and their defenders.

There are two distinct platforms on which the subject may be discussed: the lower or more general, and the higher or more particular. On the first of these, if the difficulties of the subject can not be entirely removed, the virus of the charge, at least, is easily neutralized.

First, it will not be disputed that there are circumstances which not only warrant, but so absolutely and manifestly call for the feeling and expression of indignation, that, in failing then to exhibit such feelings, a man so far comes short of being a good man. When we see men devoted to evil courses, we may well wish and pray that they may be brought to higher views and sounder principles. But perverse, obstinate persistence, in spite of experience and clear knowledge, in practices grossly evil, justly excites something besides—something different from the mere desire for the amelioration of the evil-doers. Sin involves misery, and that misery excites a good man's compassion; but sin is something more than misery, and the perception of that "something more" has its legitimate effect upon our minds. We pity a man even when his destitution arise from his own folly. But when he takes ignoble advantage of our pity, and underlying his apparent simplicity we see a cruel selfishness, a base, deliberate unrighteousness, our pity gives place to hot indignation. Nor is this indignation to be blamed. No doubt it becomes us to cherish benevolent feelings toward our fellow-men. But while benevolence is a high and beautiful principle, it is not the highest, much less the *only* principle that should regulate our conduct. And, besides, though we believe that all righteous action ultimately terminates in a

beneficent result, yet, while the sum of the entire process is beneficent, it is possible that every single step in the process may arise from a motive, not, of course, inconsistent with, but quite distinct from benevolence. And further, nowhere is he thought the best man who is least disposed to feel and express indignation at the sight of meanness and cruelty in man to man. And when the case of cruelty or meanness is flagrant, it is a mere necessity of an upright and generous nature to demand that punishment be inflicted on the evil-doers.

Now, this being so, it needs but to believe as firmly in the existence of God as in the existence of man; to love God as sincerely as we love man, and to realize as truly the rights of God as the rights of man, to justify the feeling and the expression of indignation against willful and persevering wickedness. We do not regard this consideration as removing all difficulty from the Imprecatory Psalms. But it does avail so far as to convince us that whatever other objections may be brought against them, the feelings which they express of indignation against determined sinners against God are neither misplaced nor unjustifiable. It carries us further, and warrants this stronger position, that the man who has at heart the glory of God, and who entertains a genuine reverence for truth and holiness, *would not desire* that those who trample truth and holiness under foot should go unpunished.

No man, indeed, has a right to inflict or to measure the punishment due to a fellow-man for his sins against God. But neither must compassion for our fellow-men absorb or obliterate all sense of justice, all zeal and reverence for truth and holiness, and for God himself.

We may add, further, that patriotism has its own position and rightful claim. When a nation, hoping against hope, is struggling for its existence against mighty odds, the grim watchword that denounces death as the wages of treachery is allowed by all to be as just as it is stern. Nor could we justly attach blame to the poet whose vehement verse denounced wrath against the traitor, and held him up to the bitter execration of man. Now this is a light in which we may regard the Imprecatory Psalms. For it must be remembered that, owing to the peculiar constitution under which the Hebrews lived, ungodliness was with them directly unpatriotic.

The tenure by which the people held the land was obedience to God; and it was emphatically declared, and history proved the declaration true, that disobedience would be followed by national disaster and ruin.

Now, it is evident, that the imprecations in these psalms were directed against men who were openly opposing all true religion and godliness. And when the Hebrew believer and patriot remembered the deplorable condition of bondage and prostration into which the nation had been brought in former times by the prevalence among the people of infidel principles and idolatrous practices, why was he bound to speak softly? Why is he to be blamed for wishing that punishment should be inflicted by Him to whom alone the appeal was made, upon those who trifled with the nation's safety, and perversely indulged their lawless desires and unholy inclinations in defiance of all the lessons of history, and all regard for righteousness and truth?

But we can not further enlarge upon this less important part of the subject. If these psalms are to make good their claim to form a part of the inspired word of God, we must take higher ground and make a more complete defense. What we have said, however, may suffice to show that there is no reason to shudder at these psalms as breathing any spirit of inhuman cruelty. Apart from the form of expression, which is certainly peculiar, as in every ancient thing, the general spirit of indignation against determined persisters in unrighteousness and against the enemies of the nation's welfare, is a spirit which our own consciences approve; and there are few, if any, of the Imprecatory Psalms in which it is not manifest that this is the preponderating spirit.

Dismissing, then, as groundless the charge that these psalms, by manifesting an inhuman spirit, violate the principles of ordinary morality, we ascend to the higher platform and apply a higher standard.

Admitting that it is lawful to express, on occasions, indignation against persistent unrighteousness, and that this is exemplified in the New Testament, as in what John says of Diotrephes, what Paul says of Alexander and the high-priest, and what Christ says of the Pharisees, it is objected that in the New Testament this is exceptional, whereas in these psalms it is the rule; that the New Testament habitually looks to the renewal and forgiveness of the sinner, these psalms exclusively to his punishment, and that to

extremity; that, in short, the characteristic of the New Testament is intercession, that of the psalms imprecation. Thus, it is argued, the spirit of these psalms is evidently alien and opposite to the spirit of the New Testament.

This difficulty was early recognized, and to obviate it, various explanations were offered. Of these it may be said that they were not only unsatisfactory, but were so strained and violent as to do rather more harm than the difficulty which they proposed to remove. They exhibited all the well-meaning untruthfulness of special pleading, which, in the region of religious inquiry, is far more demoralizing than the frank confession of ignorance and perplexity. We purpose to mention and briefly discuss the chief of these explanations, before stating that one which satisfies us as fairly and fully meeting the case.

First, there was an attempt to show that it was entirely owing to mistranslation that these psalms appeared to contain imprecations; that in the original the language was prophetic rather than imprecatory. This attempt, however, had to be abandoned, the instances being too numerous in which the verbs refused to bear any other than the imperative force. The explanation was then modified into this form: that these psalms, though uttered in the form of a wish or prayer, are to be *considered* as simply predictions of what would afterward come to pass, *i. e.*, that they were predictions *in the form of imprecations*. It is strange that such an explanation should ever have been propounded; for it is evident that, to find a prediction where the words signify nothing but a wish, is to violate all the laws of fair exegesis and honest interpretation. If we may admit that the inspired writer does say one thing, but, for the sake of orthodoxy, must *be regarded* as having said something quite different, there is an end altogether of the Bible as a rule of faith, and any text may support any opinion. In short, this "explanation" is a singularly rank specimen of what is usually styled "explaining *away*." But, further: if this explanation were received, it would be more disastrous to the cause which it is brought to serve than the very disaster it professes to remove. It implies, in the most emphatic way possible, that the wish, if really entertained, would be a wicked one; for the very and only ground on which it can be proposed to convert the wish into a prediction is, that the wish would be too wicked for a good man to entertain. And yet, what but the very existence of that

malign desire in the writer's heart, and his rejoicing in it, could lead him to express the prediction in the form of a wish? The explanation, therefore, is worse than the difficulty.

The next theory we notice is that which regards the Imprecatory Psalms as uttered by the psalmist when representing the Messiah—uttered, as the adherents of this theory prefer to express themselves, by the psalmist in the person of Christ, denouncing calamities against those who persecute himself and oppose his work. Now, of course, we admit that the psalmists do sometimes speak prophetically in the person of Christ. The words they utter sometimes are, in their full sense, applicable to Christ, and to Christ alone. We admit, also, that whatever may be said of those who opposed David or Asaph, none of the calamities imprecated are more than deserved by those who persecuted the Lord and resisted his redeeming work. But surely it will be admitted, on the other hand, that the words spoken for any one ought to be in character with him for whom they are spoken; that the sentiments which, by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, are uttered in the person of Christ, ought to breathe the spirit of Christ. Prophesy, of course, is nothing if it be not truth. And surely it will be admitted that the prophetic Christ of the Old Testament should be one in spirit with the actual Christ of the New; the prophetic picture should correspond in its leading features with the Gospel original. But could any two things be more dissimilar than the Gospel of Jesus is from that supposed prophetic picture? "Pour out thine indignation upon them, and let thy wrathful anger take hold of them. Let their habitation be desolate. Add iniquity to their iniquity. Let them be blotted out of the book of the living." Can that possibly be the picture of which the original is, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do?" In truth, those who advocate this theory can hardly have reflected for a moment on the nature of their argument. The precepts and practice of Jesus form the standard and test of all true spirituality and genuine charity; the test, also, by which to try whatever of precept or practice claims Divine origin. Now, the difficulty is, to see how the Imprecatory Psalms can be inspired, since, in appearance at least, they are so much at variance with those precepts and practices of Christ. How, then, is it proposed to remove this difficulty? Why, by asking us to suppose that these very psalms, the objection to

which is that they are so unchristlike, were the utterances of Christ himself, *i. e.*, to remove the contradiction between the Old Testament and the New, by making Jesus contradict his own precepts and condemn his own practice; to make Christ in the Old Testament practice as a virtue what the same Christ in the New Testament condemns as a vice. If it be answered that in these psalms Jesus speaks in the manner and spirit of the Old Testament, the reply is obvious, that it is that very manner and spirit that need to be explained. And if it be difficult to suppose that the Old Testament can be so different from the New, certainly it would be more difficult, in a tenfold degree, to suppose that Jesus could be so different from himself—Jesus, who is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever.

The last theory we mention is that which represents the psalmist as denouncing not living persons, but sins personified, so that what seem entreaties for the destruction of men are really holy desires for the overthrow of sinful principles. In short, we are to get rid of the difficulty by supposing the psalmist to use strongly figurative language. Now, if the context made it indisputable that the psalmist was referring to certain vices which were prevalent in himself or others, if he went on to personify these vices and clothe them with the attribute common to humanity, we should have no difficulty in regarding his language as figurative when he next proceeded to pray that they, the personified vices, should be starved, exiled, beaten down, and exterminated. But the context makes it evident that the psalmist was referring to injuries inflicted upon himself or his brethren, or upon the cause of God generally, by actual living men, and upon these living men he proceeds to imprecate the most fearful calamities. Now, there is notoriously so strong a tendency in human nature to revenge, that the psalmist must have known that by friend and foe his language would be understood, not figuratively, but literally, and as referring not to the sin, but to the sinner. If he really meant to express no hostile feelings to the men, but only to pray for the extirpation of their sinful habits, he certainly could not have used language more fitted to vail and misrepresent his meaning. We allow that the Hebrews were much more addicted to the concrete than the abstract modes of thinking and forms of expression. But the most devoted and extravagant lover of the concrete would never express a wish that his persecutor might

be blotted out of the book of the living, when he meant merely that he wished his persecutor were less selfish, had better principles, and a better temper. We doubt not, indeed, that even while writing the Imprecatory Psalms, the deepest desire of the psalmist's heart was, that all sin and suffering might vanish from the earth. We likewise firmly believe that the most clamorous advocate for capital punishment would rather that no murders were committed at all, than that the murderer should be executed for his crime. When letters, however, are published urging the execution of certain murderers, however readily we may admit that the writer's ultimate end is the extinction of crime, no one doubts, or has a right to doubt, that his direct and immediate aim is the extinction of the criminals. So, while we admit that the ultimate end contemplated and desired by the psalmist was the removal of sin, it violates common sense to deny that his immediate and direct desire was the terrible punishment of the sinner. These are the chief explanations hitherto current. We have made no reference to Hengstenberg, because, though his views are satisfactory so far as they go, he does not make the case of the Imprecatory Psalms sufficiently peculiar, and does not recognize the peculiar ground on which alone a complete defense can be built. This, however, is absolutely necessary, and to this we now proceed.

The condition on which the Hebrews retained possession of their land was obedience to God and faithful adherence to his worship. National disaster was threatened as the consequence of departure from this obedience and worship. This threatening was pronounced in the law; and the facts of their history, as recorded in the Pentateuch and the books of Joshua and Judges, showed that the principle was acted on, the threatenings actually carried out. The facts of their history showed that political disaster *had* ensued upon religious declension; that, in consequence of their departure from the worship of God, the nation had often been subjected to grievous afflictions, and brought sometimes to the very verge of ruin. One consequence of this we have mentioned already, namely, that the *faithful* could not but regard the avowed opponents of Jehovah-worship as directly and necessarily bringing temporal punishment, if not utter destruction upon the commonwealth. But there must have been other consequences. Imagine a people who could look back on such history as that

recorded in the book of Judges. Imagine the effect upon their minds of narratives too heroic in spirit, too graphic and picturesque in style, easily to lose their hold of the popular affections and memory; narratives, too, which display so prominently the higher agency, and the high consistent purpose which regulated both the sufferings and the deliverances which they record. The effect must have been to make those Divine interpositions be regarded as not the reminders only, but also the proof or test of Jehovah's sole divinity, and of the reality and the intimacy of his covenant relations with the people. It must have been impressed upon the nation as almost a first principle, that God's ordinary and settled method of vindicating his own cause was by inflicting temporal judgments upon those who opposed his truth. No doubt, as happens always with a multitude, the mass of the people, while assenting to the principle, would give it but little practical efficacy as a rule or motive to regulate their own conduct; would be apt to forget or disregard its tremendous bearings upon themselves. In other words, judging the mass of the people by the ordinary laws of human nature, it is reasonable to suppose that the principle, though accepted as true, would rest in their minds in a state of dormancy, needing to be roused into life and energy by some powerful appeal or extraordinary event. Still, it existed there as material, to be worked upon by either of the two active parties then in conflict with each other.

These two parties, of course, were the pious and zealous adherents of Jehovah-worship, and the avowed opponents of that system. Now, the sincere and zealous worshipers of God would not only regard this history as illustrative and corroborative of the threatenings of the law, but would regard these threatenings, thus illustrative and corroborative, as being still, in force and reality, of application in their own day. They would expect that, in similar circumstances, Divine interpositions would occur in their own time, similar to those which had characterized the nation's earlier history. They must have expected this, if they really believed, as they did, that the law was from Jehovah, and that Jehovah was supreme. Consequently, they would take the certain fulfillment of these threatenings as a source of encouragement to themselves, and as a ground of solemn warning to a wavering people. The open enemies of Jehovah-worship, on the other hand, in proportion to the length of time during which their avowed infidelity or

idolatry failed to call forth any such Divine visitation, would all the more boldly challenge the authenticity of the law and the veracity, or, at least, the received meaning of the historical record, and would dispute the fact, therefore, of Jehovah's supremacy and covenant relationship to the people. "Observe," they would be ready to say—"observe how long we have neglected your law, and are still prosperous: your law disproves itself, for the curses it threatens have not befallen us."

Thus, whether we consider these Divine interpositions as confidently relied on by the worshipers of Jehovah, or questioned and disbelieved by irreligious men, the result is so far the same. To them would both parties appeal, believers and unbelievers alike. Both parties would willingly accept the issue: if Jehovah be the sole and supreme God and the covenant God of the Hebrews, then infidelity and idolatry must be followed by temporal judgments, and that the more certainly and terrible in proportion as the infidelity and idolatry are open and prevalent. The religious party would claim as testimony in their favor whatever judgments befell the land during the prevalence of irreligion. Their opponents would regard whatever prosperity they enjoyed as proof that that strict Jehovah-worship was an unfounded delusion; that either Jehovah was nowise superior to other deities, or that, at least, he claimed no special relationship with, and exercised no special control over, the Hebrew nation. Here, then, are two conflicting parties, and the mass of the people beholding the conflict. And, considering the terms of the challenge, the nature and grounds of the conflict, there is evidently one thing only by which the issue can be determined. Let the threatenings contained in the law be fulfilled against the opponents of the Jehovah-worship, then will the truth of that worship be demonstrated. But if these threatenings are not fulfilled, then the law condemns itself, and it can not be the law of the Supreme.

Thus the prosperity of the Baal-worshiper is his justification, and the woes of the worshipers of Baal vindicate the worshiper of Jehovah. In other words, temporal prosperity becomes to the people the criterion, and the only criterion, of religious truth. Their adoption of this criterion is not to be confounded with the arrogant superstition which leads some in our own day to claim as Divine judgments in their favor all the misfortunes which befall their enemies.

We are opposed to theaters; but should a theater be burned to the ground, we see no reason to regard that conflagration as a judgment of God against theaters. We object to Sunday excursion trains; but should such a train be dashed to pieces, we have no warrant to regard that occurrence as a Divine judgment against Sabbath-breaking. But the Hebrews *had* a warrant for their belief. The Hebrew nation was under a special constitution, and that was one of the specialties; for the point in dispute was the authenticity of the Mosaic law, that being evidently identical with the truth of Jehovah-worship. And since the plain and reiterated teaching of the law was, that true religion should be rewarded by temporal blessings, and opposition to it visited with temporal punishments, the people were warranted to try the law by its own test, judging it by its own criterion, to decide that, if Baal-worshipers prospered, then Jehovah-worship was, on its own showing, false.

Since, therefore, temporal prosperity was with the people the criterion of religious truth; since the universally admitted maxim was, that God's special covenant relationship to the Hebrews involved the infliction of temporal judgments on account of covenant unfaithfulness on the part of the people; and, since the criterion and maxim were founded on God's own declared law and practice, the following result necessarily ensued: If the opponents of Jehovah-worship enjoyed freedom from any such manifestations of Divine displeasure; if temporal judgments did not follow their open disavowal of God, not only would they be themselves encouraged and confirmed in their opposition; not only would the faith of God's people be shaken and their souls be distressed, but the nation at large, whose religious affections were, at the best, but shallow and wavering, would be too likely to accept the omen and pass over to the enemy. Thus would the worship of Jehovah be overthrown, and idolatry or atheism triumphant.

What, then, was left for the psalmist to do, when he saw idolatry prevalent, and opposition to Jehovah active and abounding? There was but one way which God had as yet revealed as his method of vindicating and establishing his own cause; there was but one test which was acknowledged as convincing by the people whom it was necessary to convince: what, then, was left to the psalmist but to wish that that method might be adopted—that test employed? And what, therefore, are these Imprecatory Psalms

but earnest prayers that God would, for the sake of his own cause on the earth, apply that criterion which he himself had established—that in that manner which he had declared as his own, he would prove his cause and worship to be true?

If God had indicated no particular means as chosen by him for the vindication of his cause, then, indeed, it had been presumption and cruelty for the psalmist to have prayed that temporal judgments should be sent. But, since God, not only as King of the Universe, but as the covenant God and King of Israel, had clearly indicated temporal judgments as the special means which he had chosen to employ, the ignoring of these indications would have argued unbelief or want of loyalty. And, besides, when these psalms were not only prayers, but public prayers; when, substantially, the whole contest was, as to whether Jehovah really did exercise authority and control; when special proofs or tests were inseparably bound up with the assertion of that control; when the enemy challenged these proofs; when the people were wavering, and some already going over to the enemy, because the proof was delayed; when the people would have listened to no other argument, would have been convinced by no more spiritual reasoning, simply because they had already so plain and practical a test and argument provided by the law itself; when these things were so, the prayers of the Imprecatory Psalms were not only legitimate, but unavoidable.

It may be objected, however, that many of these psalms manifest a personal animus, as containing imprecations not on God's enemies in general, but on the psalmist's own personal enemies. In some measure this statement is true; but it must be remembered that the cause of the psalmist was identified with the cause of God in proportion (1) as the psalmist was prominent among the defenders of the truth, and (2) as the psalmist was persecuted for his adherence to Jehovah-worship, as the representative of the party devoted to that worship. And if, regarding him as such a representative, the enemy made it a question or strife between themselves and the psalmist, then the truth triumphed as the psalmist triumphed, and the truth suffered in the psalmist's defeat. Now, the case supposed did actually occur. The cause of truth did frequently embody itself, as it were, in the psalmist; and the enemy dealt with him as the salient assailable point on which an effective blow could most easily be struck. We have

shown already the way in which alone it was open to the psalmist to pray for the triumph of righteousness; and if the cause of truth were, for the time, identified with himself, the triumph or humiliation with his deliverance or defeat, there was nothing in that to prevent him from praying still for the vindication of the good cause: there was no reason why he should cease to pray for that good cause just when and just because he was himself its champion.

But this objection is generally combined with another: for it is further objected that the psalmist does not merely pray that God would send such judgments as may suffice to vindicate his cause; he specifies the particular judgments to be sent—insists, so it is said, with all the intensity of personal malice and revenge, upon the calamities which will satisfy him. His enemies are to be homeless and beggars, and their children beggars. But it is evident that, in specifying these particular calamities, the psalmist imprecated on his adversaries precisely the identical sufferings and humiliations in which they sought to involve himself: that is, he expressed in detail the very same petition which elsewhere he expresses generally, that his enemies might be taken in the snare themselves had laid, might fall into the pit themselves had dug. In our own day, even enlightened and cultivated men experience a lively satisfaction when base schemers bring upon themselves the evils they had devised against the innocent. It is felt to be a righteous recompense. But consider the tenfold force with which the righteousness of this recompense would be felt by the Hebrews, living, as they did, under the peculiar constitution already referred to! But, further: we have already said that the opponents of Jehovah-worship would regard whatever prosperity they themselves enjoyed as testimony in favor of the cause which they supported. Now, in general or national distress, many individuals retain quite abundant comforts. But even if the individual opponents of the truth did not enjoy such exemption, still, so long as their own privations were shared by the nation at large, they would naturally argue that the decision was against the other party no less than themselves; *i. e.*, that there was really no decision at all. Consequently, in order to determine the present question against the enemies of God's truth, and thus prevent the evil from spreading till it became national, and thus drew on national destruction,

the very necessity of the case demanded special judgments against special individuals. And, besides, these special judgments imprecated were clearly those which the whole history and character of the Hebrews teach us would be most impressively felt and most readily accepted as decisive by the people, while they were also the very judgments threatened in the law, the vindication of which was desired. Consequently, the definiteness of these imprecations is to be attributed, not to the personal vindictiveness of the psalmist, but to his right apprehension of the existing constitution of things, and his just appreciation of the people who lived under that constitution.

This, then, is our explanation. The law and the history taught the Hebrews to regard temporal judgments as the penalty of religious declension, and of open departure from God's service, and to regard temporal prosperity as the reward of obedience. The people, therefore, adopted this test, and would accept and be convinced by this test alone. In times of doubt and conflict, this was the only recognized and effective way of proving the reality of Jehovah's supremacy and covenant relationship. Consequently, in the Imprecatory Psalms the psalmist is simply praying in the manner which irresistible circumstances determined for the triumph of truth—praying in the only way and for the only thing intelligible and convincing to the people, and authorized by that method of disciplining his people which God had adopted.

Let us now, with as much brevity as possible, exhibit the accordance of this explanation with the actual facts. For there naturally arises the question, Did the people, as a matter of fact, adopt and act upon the views indicated above, and had the psalmist respect to this in composing these Imprecatory Psalms? And, if so, had these views any foundation in the law and the history? The latter question may be dispatched in a few words. Every one knows the general promise and warning, which, in substance, are so often repeated in the law, "It shall come to pass, if ye hearken to these judgments, and keep and do them, that the Lord thy God shall keep unto thee the covenant and the mercy which he swore unto thy fathers: and he will love thee and bless thee, and multiply thee: he will also bless the fruit of thy womb, and the fruit of thy land, thy corn and thy wine, and thine oil," etc. "And it shall be if thou do at all forget the Lord

thy God, and walk after other gods, and serve them and worship them, I testify against you this day that ye shall surely perish. As the nations which the Lord destroyeth before your face, so shall ye perish," etc. But it is also worthy of notice, that where the curses threatened are most expressly and officially set forth, it is in such a way as necessarily suggests their application to individuals. Thus, in the 28th chapter of Deuteronomy, "Thou shalt build a house, and thou shalt *not* dwell therein: thou shalt plant a vineyard, and shalt not eat the grapes thereof: thine ox shall be slain before thine eyes, and thou shalt not eat the flesh thereof," etc. And still more strongly is this brought out in the 29th chapter, where the whole case is solemnly recapitulated, and where, in the 18th and following verses, there is a singling out of tribes, families, and individuals; and of the individual law-breaker it is said, "The Lord will not spare him, but the anger of the Lord and his jealousy shall smoke against that man, and all the curses that are written in this book shall lie upon him," etc. Now, it will hardly be denied that such language did afford warrant for the belief that departure from and opposition to God's worship would be regarded as covenant-breaking and rebellion, and that temporal judgments would be inflicted as the penalty of disobedience. And such language also fairly implies that, although the curse might not be inflicted upon a man the moment he sinned, yet, the more his sin became open, the more did the curse become imminent, and persistence in the sin would insure the infliction of the curse. And it is further to be noticed that, while the history contains many instances of both general and singular judgments on account of sin—general, as in the times of bondage recorded in the book of Judges; singular, as in the case of Nadab and Abihu, Dathan and Abiram, Abimelech (Gideon's son), Eli, Solomon, etc.—there is no instance of intercession being made either for person or people, *during their sin: i. e.*, in case of disobedience or revolt against God, the believer was not taught or required to pray for the conversion of the sinner, and, through that, for his salvation. He was required to take his stand promptly on the Lord's side, and to acquiesce in, and, if need be, execute, his judgments against the ungodly. One of the duties required of them was solemnly to record this acquiescence. The Levites shall say, "Cursed be the man, * * and all the people shall say, Amen."

In these and similar passages there does seem enough to warrant the view which we have supposed to influence the people; and enough, therefore, to constrain the psalmist to offer the prayers contained in the Imprecatory Psalms. The next more important question is, *Were* the people actually thus influenced, and was it from regard to these views, thus influencing the people, and authorized by God, that the psalmist prayed as he did? Of course, we have no statement either from the open enemies of God, or from the indifferent mass of the people. Nor have we any formal statement from the psalmist himself. But though the evidence is of an indirect kind, it is amply sufficient. We are all familiar with the psalmist's plea, "Wherefore should the heathen say, Where is their God?" "My tears have been my meat day and night, while they continually say unto me, Where is thy God? As with a sword in my bones, mine enemies reproach me, while they say daily unto me, Where is thy God." And as a comment upon these verses may be taken Ps. xxii: 7, "All they that see me, laugh me to scorn; they shoot out the lip, they shake the head, saying, He trusted on the Lord that he would deliver him: let him deliver him, seeing he delighted (or if he delighted) in him." Here we see that it was the psalmist's bitter experience that the enemy was only too ready to apply the test to him. The words are too manifestly wrung from him by the bitter anguish of his heart, to let us suppose that they are any thing less than the genuine record of experience. It is also evident that these gibes with which his enemies tortured him were the result not of mere unbelief and enmity to God, but of enmity and unbelief justifying themselves by the apparent overthrow of the psalmist's hopes. There should have happened, had the psalmist been right, blessings to him and judgment upon his enemies. Nothing of this had as yet appeared; wherefore the enemies scoff and say, "Where is thy God?" And the psalmist appeals to God to apply this test, even though it should operate against himself. Ps. vii: 3—"If I have done this; if there be iniquity in my hands, * * * let the enemy persecute my soul, and take it," etc.; then, being confident of his innocence, he beseeches God to "rise in his anger" against the enemy; then, in the fervid close of the psalm, he brings out the principle. For while he prays for judgments upon his oppressor, it is for this end, viz., (verse 9), "O, let the wickedness of the wicked

come to an end; but establish the just." We can not quote every passage bearing upon the point, but the following may suffice: Ps. lxxiv: 28—"They said in their hearts, Let us destroy them together: they have burned up all the synagogues of God in the land. We see not our signs. * * * O God, how long shall the adversary reproach? Shall the enemy blaspheme thy name forever? Why withdrawest thou thy hand, even thy right hand? Pluck it out of thy bosom. * * * Arise, O God, plead thine own cause." Ps. lxxix: 10—"Wherefore should the heathen say, Where is their God? Let him be known among the heathen in our sight by the revenge of the blood of thy servants which is shed." The imprecations of the 58th Psalm are closed with the plea, "So that a man shall say, Verily there is a reward for the righteous: verily he is a God that judgeth in the earth." And in the 59th Psalm, 11th verse, "Slay them not, lest my people forget;" that is, let not the execution be too rapid, lest the salutary lesson be lost; nevertheless, "scatter them by thy power, and bring them down. * * * Consume them that they may not be: and (thus) let them know that God ruleth in Jacob unto the end of the earth."

Now, it must be evident, from these passages, that the great object of the psalmist's desire was the prosperity of God's cause, the advancement of his glory; that the only means known to him whereby, in a time of conflict, these ends were to be accomplished, were the infliction of temporal judgments upon God's enemies, and the bestowment of temporal blessings upon his people; that he found that, in proportion as God was inactive (so to speak) as to the infliction and bestowment of these, iniquity was bold and abounding, and that for this boldness the psalmist felt that in the circumstances there was too much show of reason; and that, finally, the psalmist claimed as due from the covenant faithfulness of God, that he should *manifest* his displeasure with the wicked, and his approval of his own followers.

It is true that, as time went on, this physical training, as we may call it, merged into the higher region of moral training. In early times, indeed, the higher note was struck. But the tone in these early times differed in a notable particular from the tone in the subsequent period. Thus, in the book of Job, is first brought out distinctly God's higher method of dealing with his people; but it is brought out as the corrective of that physical training,

not its substitute. Nay, the book of Job itself is constructed in accordance with this system of physical training, for the discipline of Job by humiliation avowedly abnormal, adopted in extraordinary circumstances, and for a special purpose; while, at the close of the drama, when order is restored, it is by the bestowment of temporal rewards upon the patriarch. And throughout Job's training, the lesson taught him is, not to distrust the physical training; but to acknowledge that, while God did distinguish his people from his enemies, yet that the rewards of the righteous were entirely of God's grace, not of their absolute deserving. And there was thus administered a corrective to that vice of self-righteousness, which was undoubtedly apt to grow up under the system of temporal distinctions, which was, therefore, one of the inherent weaknesses of that system, rendering it unfit as a discipline for the after-growth, the spiritual manhood of the Church. In these earlier times, then, glimpses of that higher training were afforded for the purpose of correcting the physical, and preserving its efficiency. But it was otherwise in the time of the later psalmists. Then, the physical shaded off into the moral training, manifestly for these two reasons, both of which appear on the very surface of the later literature: 1. That the physical was, from the beginning, intended to prepare for the moral discipline, and, therefore, as the great fulfillment of the times drew near, the higher training thus prepared for was gradually administered. 2. The people were obstinately bent to evil, so that the voice of God to the people was, "Why should ye be stricken any more? Ye will revolt more and more." Therefore, the awful rod was withdrawn from individuals. If we could conceive of a Divine despair of doing good any longer by merciful dealings, it was manifested then. So the temporal judgments sent on individuals to preserve the nation began to cease, and were gradually absorbed into the gathering darkness of the rebellious nation's final doom. But still, to the end of that ancient economy, so far, at least, as it is represented in the Scripture, what we called the physical training was predominant, and was acted on. Thus, in the book of Nehemiah, we find that eminent man of God using language which would be painful in the extreme if uttered in our day by any one whom we esteemed for piety or wisdom. But Nehemiah was, undoubtedly, both a wise and a pious man, and his language becomes at once consistent with that character, when we see he is but urging the old plea, recognizing that the ancient disci-

pline is still in force. And thus, also, in the prophesy of Malachi, temporal blessings are still the form in which God's favor is promised; the want of prosperity among God's people still the stumbling-block to the wavering. On the one hand it is still, "Bring ye all the tithes into the storehouse, * * * and I will pour you out a blessing that there shall not be room enough to receive it; and I will rebuke the devourer for your sake, and he shall not destroy the fruits of the ground," etc. And, on the other hand, it is still, "It is vain to serve God; * * * they that work wickedness are set up." And while, as was fitting at the close of the older and darker dispensation, the brightness of the great dawn was sensibly spreading upward from the horizon, and giving a certain wanness to the feebler luminary, yet the feebler luminary still ruled the sky.

In the 73d Psalm we see, perhaps, the first—certainly the most interesting—indication of the dawning of Gospel light upon this subject, and its bewildering effect upon God's people—bewildering, for there must needs be progress; but then, as now, progress in all that is good and great was inseparable from trial and pain. Transition from a lower to a higher discipline is not easily recognized as such at the time of its occurrence. Men are slow to see the nature of the new, and still slower to believe its Divine origin—its worth and stability. It is not the advent of the new, but the removal of the old, that is at first apprehended; consequently, such a change is too apt to be regarded merely as the loosening of the foundations—the dissolution of the reality of all true and definite relations between the soul and God. Ungodly men, therefore, rejoice, while faith is severely tried. In the 73d Psalm we see faith's hard battle under what seems the ruin of its old empire. It seemed that prosperity belonged to the ungodly, while adversity was the believer's portion. For awhile the psalmist's faith is staggered, is almost overthrown; but in the house of God, having acquired that clear sight and serene gaze usual when a soul in its sorrow betakes itself to trustful and submissive communion with God, he obtains a glimpse of God's higher and grander purposes. He sees that the great possession of the righteous, and the high reward bestowed on them, is the favor of God and communion with him—an inheritance reaching up to a future life, and there only unfolding the fullness of its treasures. At length, therefore, peace returns to him, and he looks hopefully forward to that glorious eternal future. But while

the psalm exhibits the exercise of faith under a trying discipline, and while to men like the psalmist it must have come like a flash of heaven's own light, revealing in its majesty, proportions, and infinite beauty, the broader and grander economy, yet, from the psalm itself, God's purpose is evident, viz., that until the more enlarged views have percolated from the higher to the lower strata of spiritual understanding, the old discipline, if in diminished extent, yet, in quite definite and still predominant efficiency, was still to remain, to determine the prayers of the faithful.

In conclusion, if we are now asked whether, after all, the spirit of these psalms is consistent with the spirit of the Gospel, we think it enough to answer, as we have now a right to answer, that the question as to these psalms is involved in, and really identical with, the question as to the reasonableness and righteousness of the whole discipline by which the people were trained under the Old Testament dispensation. If the Divine origin of that dispensation be denied, then it is useless to discuss the inspiration of these psalms; the battle must be fought on another field: but if the Divine origin of that dispensation be admitted, the admission covers the case of the Imprecatory Psalms.

But, more particularly: the essential spirit of these psalms is the earnest desire that God would defend and further his own cause in his own appointed way. It is our duty to cherish that desire still; and the more we do so, the more are our hearts in unison with these psalms and with the Gospel. The spirit of the Gospel, *i. e.*, of true spiritual religion, is believing, acceptance of, and acquiescence in, God's will as revealed to us, and earnest endeavor to conform our lives to that will. The revelation of God's will given in the Old Testament differs in some respects from the revelation given of it in the New, because the circumstances were different in which the revelations were made. But the revelations were afforded by the same Jehovah, for the same essential purposes, and to the same spirit of faithful, loving obedience in his people. We would not, indeed, have the singing of these psalms included in the devotional exercises of a Christian congregation, because, though the great end sought in them is the same great end which we seek, and which the Church must seek to the end of time, yet it is there sought in a manner which is now obsolete. It is there sought in a manner and by means which belonged to a dispensation which, though righteous, was temporary, and has, therefore, passed away, bearing that manner along with it. And

just as we would not have the poets of our own day write in the antiquated language of Chaucer, or rather, as in our maturity we do not kneel to utter those prayers which we use in our childhood, though we love to hear our children lisping the same prayers still, so we would not have the Church, in its spiritual manhood, utter those prayers which were intended specially and distinctively for the spiritual childhood of the Church. But we do recognize them as well suited to that age, and asking nothing which it was not right to ask. The form is childhood's form; the spirit is the spirit of the life of all ages. Their language, unquestionably, is stern, but because it is the responsive echo to a stern but necessary discipline. Men needed to have it emphatically impressed upon them that God was One, spiritual, righteous, and resolved to punish sin. This was a stern truth, but was the truth for the time, and, therefore, the truth at that time specially revealed. But, as the green corn is not inconsistent with, but prepares for the ripe corn of the genial harvest-time; as the physical training and restraint of the child is not inconsistent with, but prepares for the moral training and freedom of the man; so that stern truth, and the manner in which it was impressed on men, were not inconsistent with geniality of Gospel grace, but were rather the very foundation of it, and its necessary prerequisite. Men must first be made to realize the majesty of righteousness in its opposition to sin before it is well, even for their own sakes, to show them righteousness glorified in grace to the sinner. The Imprecatory Psalms, then, were but the responsive cadence that arose from those breasts which submitted to the discipline whereby God taught them to realize the truth which alone could fit them to receive, in its full beneficence, the larger truth that was to follow. It may be—for in this, as in other respects, the law was weak through the flesh—it may be that some in the ancient Church sang these psalms without adequate apprehension of their true spirit and purpose; that, in the impatience of fear, or the extremity of sore suffering, they thought of little beyond a full retaliation upon their enemies. But these psalms themselves bear a far nobler and grander impress. The earnest desire they breathe is, that the truth, the righteousness, the *reality* of God may shine forth to man. And if this be incompatible with the impunity to the enemies of all truth and righteousness, then let that impunity cease, for the earth must not remain in bondage, nor God's name in dishonor, that wicked men may prosper.

There is another aspect in which the subject may be viewed. On this our space allows but a word or two. The Church of God, *in all ages*, has been a missionary Church. In Christian times it is called to active effort and enterprise. Under the old dispensation it was more passive; it simply stood up before men as the evidence of the nature and reality of the one spiritual Jehovah, and of the nature and nobleness of his worship, so that men beholding this worship, beholding the Church, and convinced by the testimony it bore, might be brought to serve the same God. If we consider the geographical and political relations of the Hebrew nation, we shall see that it is was well placed, so as to influence what in other respects were the centers of influence for the whole earth—grand reflectors to shed abroad over the world what light they might borrow from the clear shining of the chosen people. The modern Church is a company of torch-bearers, to *carry* the light into the dark places. The ancient Church was a stationary light, intended to lighten all around it, and provided with a fitting apparatus to diffuse its radiance afar. But, of course, its efficacy depended upon its efficiency; the light must burn brightly. It was the light of the world. If the light, therefore, became darkness, how great the darkness! Consequently, the very instinctive desire to fulfill the great end or purpose for which they were placed there, would justly and necessarily lead the earnest and faithful ones in the Church to pray for the destruction of whatever tended to diminish the luster and defeat the object of this great luminary.

We have shown, then, that these psalms, even taken by themselves, must be acquitted of the charge of cruelty and revenge, and of inconsistency with the spirit of the Gospel. At the same time we think it unfair to isolate them, as they are so generally isolated from the rest of the psalter. They form one member which is in living relation to the whole, and the character of the whole should be taken into account before the character of this one part is determined. It is not that we would soften down one word uttered in them. They were meant to speak sternly. But no theory of these psalms is a right one which does not recognize that, though the psalmists did speak sternly when occasion compelled them, yet, when circumstances permitted it, they rejoiced to contemplate the glory of God and extension of his kingdom in connection with the peace and happiness of all men.

THE AUTHORIZED VERSION OF THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE ROMANS REVISED.*

[The following version of the Epistle of Paul to the Romans by a number of eminent scholars of the Church of England, made as it is in a conservative spirit and with good judgment, will be helpful, it is believed, to ministers of the Gospel and others who often wish to see at a glance whether any important change is supposed to be required in the rendering of a given passage, while it will tend to reassure the minds of those who may have become distrustful of the authorized version. In a few passages, the translators, it will be seen, have felt obliged to vary from the Greek text of Stephens. These do not exceed fifty-five in all. It is only necessary to add that, whenever the translators could not agree, the decision was made by the majority.—Ed.]

CHAPTER I.

Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, set apart unto the gospel of God, [2] which he promised afore by his prophets in the holy scriptures, [3] concerning his Son, which was born of the seed of David according to the flesh, [4] which was with power declared to be the Son of God, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection of the dead, even Jesus Christ our Lord; [5] through whom we received grace and apostleship, unto obedience of faith among all the nations, for his name's sake: [6] among whom are ye also, Jesus Christ's called: [7] to all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints: grace be unto you and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ. [8] First, I thank my God through Jesus Christ for you all, that your faith is published throughout the whole world. [9] For God is my witness, whom I serve in my spirit in the gospel of his Son, how unceasingly I make mention of you, always in my prayers [10] making request, if by any means now at length I may have a way opened by the will of God to come unto you. [11] For I long to see you, that I may impart unto you some spiritual gift, to the

* From the *Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans, after the Authorized Version, newly compared with the original Greek, and revised,* by Five Clergymen. [John Barrow, D. D., George Moberly, D. C. L., Henry Alford, B. D., William G. Humphrey, B. D., Charles J. Ellicott, B. D.]—Second Edition, London, 1858.

end that ye may be established; [12] that is, that I with you may be comforted among you, each by the faith which is in the other, both yours and mine. [13] But I would not have you ignorant, brethren, that oftentimes I purposed to come unto you, (but was hindered hitherto), that I might have some fruit in you too, even as also in the rest of the Gentiles. [14] I am debtor both to Greeks and Barbarians; both to the wise and the foolish. [15] So, as much as in me lieth, I am ready to preach the gospel to you also that are in Rome. [16] For I am not ashamed of the gospel: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. [17] For the righteousness of God is therein revealed from faith unto faith: even as it is written, But the righteous shall live by faith. [18] For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold down the truth in unrighteousness; [19] because that which is known of God is manifest in them; for God manifested it unto them: [20] for from the creation of the world his invisible things, even his eternal power and divinity, are plainly seen, being perceived by means of the things that are made: so that they may be without excuse: [21] because though they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither gave thanks; but were brought to vanity in their reasonings, and their heart being without understanding was darkened. [22] Professing themselves to be wise, they were made fools, [23] and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God for the likeness of an image of corruptible man, and of birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things. [24] Wherefore God also gave them up in the desires of their hearts to uncleanness, to dishonor their bodies among themselves: [25] inasmuch as they changed the truth of God for a lie, and worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed forever. Amen. [26] For this cause God gave them up unto shameful passions: for even their women changed the natural use into that which is against nature: [27] and in like manner the men also, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working unseemliness, and receiving in themselves the recompense of their error which was meet. [28] And even as they did not choose to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them up to a reprobate mind, to do the things which are not fit to be done; [29] being filled with all unrighteousness, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full

of envy, murder, strife, deceit, malignity; whisperers, [30] slanderers, hated of God, insolent, proud, boasters, devisers of evil things, disobedient to parents, [31] without understanding, covenant breakers, without natural affection, unmerciful: [32] men who knowing well the righteous judgment of God, that they which do such things are worthy of death, not only commit the same, but also consent unto them that do them.

CHAPTER II.

WHEREFORE thou art without excuse, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest thy neighbor, thou condemnest thyself: for thou that judgest doest the same things. [2] Now we know that the judgment of God is according to truth against them which do such things. [3] And reckonest thou this, O man, that judgest them which do such things, and committest the same, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God? [4] Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness and his forbearance and his long-suffering; not knowing that the goodness of God is leading thee to repentance; [5] and after thy hardness and impenitent heart art treasuring up for thyself wrath in the day of wrath and of the revelation of the righteous judgment of God; [6] who will render to every man according to his works: [7] to them who by patience in well-doing seek for glory and honor and incorruption, eternal life: [8] but to them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, [shall there be] indignation and wrath, [9] tribulation and distress, upon every soul of man that worketh evil, of the Jew first, and also of the Greek; [10] but glory, and honor, and peace, to every man that worketh good, to the Jew first, and also to the Greek: [11] for there is no respect of persons with God. [12] For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law: and as many as have sinned under the law shall be judged by the law; [13] for not the hearers of the law are righteous before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified: [14] for when Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things of the law, these, though they have not the law, are the law unto themselves; [15] inasmuch as they shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness thereto, and their thoughts accusing or else defending them one with another: [16] in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel. [17] But if thou art called a Jew, and

rested upon the law, and makest thy boast in God, [18] and knowest his will, and discernest the things that are more excellent, being instructed out of the law; [19] and art confident that thou thyself art a guide of the blind, a light of them which are in darkness, [20] an instructor of the foolish, a teacher of babes, possessing the model of knowledge and of the truth in the law; [21] thou then which teachest another, dost thou not teach thyself? thou that preachest men should not steal, dost thou steal? [22] thou that forbiddest to commit adultery, dost thou commit adultery? thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou rob temples? [23] thou that makest thy boast in the law, dost thou by thy transgression of the law dishonor God? [24] for the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles because of you, even as it is written. [25] For circumcision indeed is profitable, if thou do the law; but if thou be a transgressor of the law, thy circumcision is become uncircumcision. [26] If then the uncircumcision keep the ordinances of the law, shall not his uncircumcision be reckoned for circumcision; [27] and shall not the uncircumcision which is by nature, if it fulfill the law, judge thee, who through the letter and circumcision art a transgressor of the law? [28] For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: [29] but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is of the heart, in the spirit, not in the letter; the praise whereof is not of men, but of God.

CHAPTER III.

What then is the advantage of the Jew? or what is the benefit of circumcision? [2] Much every way: first indeed that they were intrusted with the oracles of God. [3] For what if some did not believe? shall their unbelief make void the faithfulness of God? [4] God forbid: nay, let God be true, and every man a liar; as it is written, That thou mayest be justified in thy words, and mayest overcome when thou art judged. [5] But if our unrighteousness establisheth the righteousness of God, what shall we say? Is God unrighteous who inflicteth his wrath? (I speak as a man.) [6] God forbid: for then how shall God judge the world? [7] for if by my lie the truth of God abounded unto his glory; why am I still to be judged as a sinner? [8] And [why should we] not [say] as we be slanderously reported, and as some affirm that we say, Let us do evil, that good may come? whose condemnation is just.

[9]What then? do we excel them? No, in no wise: for we before brought the charge against both Jews and Greeks, that they are all under sin; [10]as it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one: [11]there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. [12]They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not so much as one. [13]Their throat is an open sepulcher; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips: [14]whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness: [15]their feet are swift to shed blood: [16]destruction and misery are in their ways: [17]and the way of peace have they not known. [18]There is no fear of God before their eyes. [19]Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it speaketh to them who are under the law; in order that every mouth may be stopped, and that all the world may be brought under the judgment of God. [20]Because by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for through the law [cometh] the knowledge of sin. [21]But now apart from the law the righteousness of God hath been manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; [22]even the righteousness of God through faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all that believe: for there is no distinction: [23]for all have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God; [24]being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: [25]whom God set forth as a propitiation through faith by his blood, for the shewing forth of his righteousness, because of the passing over of the former sins, in the forbearance of God; [26]for the shewing forth of his righteousness in this present time, that he may be just and the justifier of him which is of faith in Jesus. [27]Where is our boasting then? It is excluded. By what manner of law? of works? Nay: but by the law of faith. [28]For we reckon that a man is justified by faith apart from the works of the law. [29]Is God [the God] of the Jews only? is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also: [30]seeing that God is one, which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and the uncircumcision through faith. [31]Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: nay, we establish the law.

CHAPTER IV.

WHAT then shall we say that Abraham our father hath found as pertaining to the flesh? [2]for if Abraham was justified by

works, he hath ground of boasting. But he hath none before God: [3] for what saith the scripture? And Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness. [4] Now to him that worketh, his reward is not reckoned in the way of grace, but of debt; [5] but to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is reckoned for righteousness. [6] Even as David also declareth the man blessed, unto whom God reckoneth righteousness apart from works, [7] [saying] Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. [8] Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not reckon sin. [9] Is this blessing then pronounced upon the circumcision, or upon the uncircumcision also? for we say that faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness. [10] How then was it reckoned? when he was in circumcision, or in uncircumcision? Not [when he was] in circumcision, but in uncircumcision. [11] And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had while in his uncircumcision: in order that he might be the father of all in uncircumcision that believe; that the righteousness might be reckoned unto them also: [12] and [that he might be] the father of the circumcision to them who are not only of the circumcision, but to them also who walk in the steps of the faith of our father Abraham, which he had while in uncircumcision. [13] For it was not through the law that the promise was given to Abraham or to his seed that he should be the heir of the world, but through the righteousness of faith. [14] For if they which are of the law be the heirs, faith is made void, and the promise is made of none effect: [15] for the law worketh wrath: for where there is no law, neither is there transgression. [16] For this cause is [the inheritance] of faith, that it may be by grace; in order that the promise may be sure to all the seed, not only to that which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham; who is the father of us all, [17] (as it is written, A father of many nations have I made thee,) before God in whose sight he believed, who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not as though they were: [18] who against hope believed in hope, that he might become the father of many nations, according to that which was spoken, So shall thy seed be. [19] And not being weak in faith, he considered not his own body, now become dead, being about an hundred years old, nor the deadness of Sarah's womb: [20] he staggered not at the promise of God

through unbelief; but was made strong in faith, giving glory to God, [21] and being fully persuaded that what he hath promised he is able also to perform. [22] Wherefore also it was reckoned unto him for righteousness. [23] Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was reckoned unto him; [24] but for our sake also, to whom it shall be reckoned, to us [I say] who believe on him that raised Jesus our Lord from the dead: [25] who was delivered up for our offenses, and was raised for our justification.

CHAPTER V.

Being then justified by faith, let us have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ; [2] through whom we have also had our access by faith into this grace wherein we stand; and we glory in the hope of the glory of God. [3] And not only so, but we also glory in our tribulations: knowing that tribulation worketh patience; [4] and patience, approval; and approval, hope: [5] and hope maketh not ashamed; because the love of God hath been poured forth in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which was given unto us. [6] For when we were yet without strength, in due season Christ died for the ungodly. [7] For scarcely for a righteous man will any one die: yet for a good man peradventure some one doth even dare to die. [8] But God commendeth his own love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. [9] Much more then, having been now justified by his blood, shall we be saved through him from the wrath [to come]. [10] For if, being enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son, much more, having been reconciled, shall we be saved by his life: [11] and not only so, but also glorying in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received our reconciliation. [12] For this cause, as through one man sin entered into the world, and through sin, death; and thus death spread through unto all men, for that all were sinners: [13] for until the law there was sin in the world: but sin is not imputed where there is no law. [14] Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that sinned not after the likeness of the transgression of Adam, who is a type of him that was to come. [15] Howbeit not as the trespass, so also is the gift of grace. For if by the trespass of the one the many died, much more did the grace of God and his free gift abound unto the many by the grace of the one man Jesus Christ. [16] And not as through one that sinned, so is the gift: for the judgment

came of one unto condemnation, but the gift of grace came of many trespasses unto justification. [17] For if by the trespass of the one, death reigned through the one, much more shall they which receive the abundance of the grace and of the free gift of righteousness reign in life through the one, even Jesus Christ. [18] Therefore as through one trespass [the issue was] unto all men to condemnation; even so through one righteous act [the issue was] unto all men to justification of life. [19] For as through the disobedience of the one man the many were made sinners, even so through the obedience of the one shall the many be made righteous. [20] Now the law came in also, that the trespass might be multiplied. But where sin was multiplied, grace did beyond measure abound: [21] in order that as sin reigned in death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.

CHAPTER VI.

What then shall we say? Are we to continue in sin, that grace may be multiplied? [2] God forbid. We who died unto sin, how shall we live any longer therein? [3] Know ye not that all we who were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? [4] We were buried therefore with him through our baptism into his death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life. [5] For if we have become united to the likeness of his death, surely we shall be also to the likeness of his resurrection: [6] knowing this, that our old man was crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, in order that we might no longer be in bondage to sin. [7] For he that hath died hath been set free from sin. [8] Now if we died with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him: [9] knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath dominion over him no more. [10] For the death that he died, he died unto sin once: but the life that he liveth, he liveth unto God. [11] Even so reckon ye yourselves to be dead unto sin, but alive unto God in Christ Jesus. [12] Let not sin then reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey the lusts thereof. [13] Neither yield ye your members unto sin as instruments of unrighteousness: but yield yourself up to God as those that were dead and are alive, and your members unto God as instruments of righteousness. [14] For sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under

the law, but under grace. [15] What then? are we to sin, because we are not under the law, but under grace? God forbid. [16] Know ye not, that to whomsoever ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are whom ye obey; whether it be of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness? [17] But thanks be to God, that ye were [once] servants of sin, but ye obeyed from the heart the form of doctrine whereunto ye were delivered; [18] and being made free from sin, ye were made servants to righteousness. [19] I speak after the manner of men because of the infirmity of your flesh: for as ye yielded your members servants to uncleanness and to iniquity to work iniquity; so now yield your members servants to righteousness unto sanctification. [20] For when ye were servants of sin, ye were free in regard of righteousness. [21] What fruit then had ye at that time in those things whereof ye are now ashamed? for the end of these things is death. [22] But now being made free from sin, and made servants to God, ye have your fruit unto sanctification, and the end everlasting life. [23] For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life in Jesus Christ our Lord.

CHAPTER VII.

Know ye not, brethren, (for I am speaking to men that know the law), how that the law hath dominion over a man for so long time as he liveth? [2] for the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband while he liveth; but if her husband die, she is loosed from the law of the husband. [3] Therefore if, while her husband liveth, she be joined to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband die, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be joined to another man. [4] So then, my brethren, ye also were made dead to the law through the body of Christ; that ye might be joined to another, even to him who was raised from the dead, to the intent that we should bring forth fruit unto God. [5] For when we were in the flesh, the stirrings of sins, which were through the law, were active in our members so as to bring forth fruit unto death. [6] But now we have been loosed from the law, having died unto that wherein we were held; so as to serve in the newness of the spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter. [7] What then shall we say? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nevertheless, I had not known sin, except through the law: for I had not

known coveting, if the law had not said, Thou shalt not covet. [8] But sin having found an occasion through the commandment wrought in me all manner of coveting. For without the law sin is dead. [9] And I was alive without the law once: but when the commandment came, sin came to life, and I died; [10] and the very commandment which was for life, I found to be for death. [11] For sin having found an occasion through the commandment, deceived me, and through it slew me. [12] So that the law is holy, and the commandment is holy, and righteous, and good. [13] Hath then that which is good become death unto me? God forbid: but sin [became death unto me], to the end that it might be shown to be sin, working death to me through that which is good; that through the commandment sin might become exceeding sinful. [14] For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold into the power of sin. [15] For what I perform that I know not: for not what I desire that do I; but what I hate, that I do. [16] But if I do that which I desire not, I consent unto the law that it is good. [17] So now it is no longer I that perform it, but sin that dwelleth in me. [18] For I know that there dwelleth not in me, that is, in my flesh, any good: for to desire is present with me; but to perform that which is good I find not. [19] For the good that I desire, I do not: but the evil which I desire not, that I do. [20] But if I do that I desire not, it is no longer I that perform it, but the sin that dwelleth in me. [21] I find therefore this law, that, when I desire to do that which is good, evil is present with me. [22] For I delight in the law of God after the inward man: [23] but I see a different law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. [24] O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death? [25] I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then I myself serve the law of God with the mind; but with the flesh the law of sin.

CHAPTER VIII.

[1] There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus. [2] For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus set me free from the law of sin and of death. [3] For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: [4] that the righteous demand of the law

might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. [5] For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit. [6] For the mind of the flesh is death; but the mind of the Spirit is life and peace. [7] Because the mind of the flesh is enmity against God: for it doth not submit itself to the law of God, neither indeed can it: [8] and they that are in the flesh can not please God. [9] But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if the Spirit of God dwelleth in you. But if any man hath not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. [10] And if Christ is in you, the body indeed is dead by reason of sin: but the spirit is life by reason of righteousness. [11] And if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwelleth in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall quicken even your mortal bodies by reason of his Spirit that dwelleth in you. [12] Therefore, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh, that we should live after the flesh. [13] For if ye live after the flesh, ye must die: but if by the Spirit ye mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live. [14] For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are sons of God. [15] For ye did not receive the spirit of bondage [leading] back unto fear; but ye received the spirit of adoption, wherein we cry, Abba, Father. [16] The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are children of God: [17] and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if we are suffering with him, to the end that we may also be glorified with him. [18] For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are of no account in comparison of the glory which is to be revealed in us. [19] For the earnest expectation of the creation is waiting for the revelation of the sons of God. [20] For the creation was made subject to vanity, not of its own will, but by reason of Him who made it subject, in hope, [21] that even the creation itself shall be set free from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God. [22] For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now: [23] and not only so, but even we ourselves which have the firstfruit of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body. [24] For in hope were we saved: but hope that is seen is not hope: for what a man seeth, why doth he also hope for? [25] But if we hope for what we see not, we wait for it with patience. [26] In like manner doth the

Spirit also help our weakness: for we know not what we should pray for as we ought: but the Spirit itself maketh intercession [for us] with groanings which can not be uttered: [27] but he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, that he maketh intercession for the saints according to [the will of] God. [28] Moreover we know that, to them that love God, all things work together for good, [even] to them who according to [his] purpose are called. [29] Because whom he foreknew, them he also foreordained to bear the likeness of the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren; [30] and whom he foreordained, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified. [31] What then shall we say to these things? If God is for us, who shall be against us? [32] He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not also with him freely give us all things? [33] Who shall bring any charge against God's elect? God is he that justifieth; [34] Who is he that condemneth? Christ is he that died, yea more, that is also risen again, who is also at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us. [35] Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? [36] Even as it is written, For thy sake are we being killed all the day long; we were accounted as sheep for the slaughter. [37] Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us. [38] For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, [39] nor hight, nor depth, nor any other created thing, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

CHAPTER IX.

I SAY the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost, [2] that I have great sorrow and unceasing anguish in my heart: [3] for I could wish that I myself were accursed from Christ in behalf of my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh: [4] who are Israelites; to whom belongeth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service [of the sanctuary], and the promises: [5] whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh is Christ, who is God over all, blessed for ever. Amen. [6] Not as

though the word of God hath fallen to the ground. For not all they which are of Israel are Israel: [7] nor yet, because they are Abraham's seed, are they all children: but, In Isaac shall thy seed be called. [8] That is, Not they which are the children of the flesh are the children of God: but the children of the promise are reckoned for the seed. [9] For this is the word of promise, According to this time I will come, and Sarah shall have a son. [10] And not only so; but when Rebecca also had conceived by one, even by our father Isaac; [11] for when [the children] were not yet born, and had not done any thing good or evil, to the end that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not depending on works, but on him that calleth; [12] it was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger: [13] even as it is written, Jacob I loved, but Esau I hated. [14] What then shall we say? Is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid. [15] For he saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whomsoever I have mercy, and I will have compassion on whomsoever I have compassion. [16] Therefore it is not of him that willeth, nor yet of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy. [17] For the scripture saith unto Pharaoh, For this very purpose did I raise thee up, that I may shew forth my power in thee, and that my name may be published abroad in all the earth. [18] Therefore he hath mercy on whom he will, and whom he will he hardeneth. [19] Thou wilt say then unto me, Why then doth he yet find fault? For who resisteth his will? [20] Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why didst thou make me thus? [21] Hath not the potter power over the clay, out of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor, and another unto dishonor? [22] What if God, purposing to shew forth his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much long-suffering vessels of wrath fitted for destruction: [23] and to the end that he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy, which he had afore prepared unto glory, [24] whom he also called, even us, not from among the Jews only, but also from among the Gentiles? [25] As he saith also in Hosea, I will call them my people, which were not my people; and her beloved, which was not beloved. [26] And it shall be, that in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people; there shall they be called sons of the living God. [27] Moreover Isaiah crieth concerning Israel, Though the number of the sons of Israel

be as the sand of the sea, the remnant shall be saved: [28] for he is finishing the reckoning, and cutting it short in righteousness: because a short reckoning will the Lord make upon the earth. [29] And as Isaiah hath said before, Except the Lord of Sabaoth had left us a seed, we had become as Sodom, and had been made like unto Gomorrah. [30] What then shall we say? That the Gentiles, which follow not after righteousness, attained to righteousness, even the righteousness which is of faith. [31] But Israel, following after the law of righteousness, arrived not at the law [of righteousness]. [32] Wherefore? Because [following after it] not by faith, but as by the works of the law, they stumbled against the stone of stumbling. [33] Even as it is written, Behold, I lay in Sion a stone of stumbling and rock of offense: and he that believeth thereon shall not be put to shame.

CHAPTER X.

Brethren, my heart's desire and my supplication to God on their behalf is for [their] salvation. [2] For I bear them witness that they have a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge. [3] For not knowing the righteousness of God, and seeking to set up their own righteousness, they have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God. [4] For Christ is the end of the law unto righteousness to every one that believeth. [5] For Moses describeth the righteousness which is of the law, [saying] The man which hath done them shall live in them. [6] But the righteousness which is of faith speaketh on this wise, Say not in thine heart, Who shall ascend into heaven? (that is, to bring Christ down:) [7] or, Who shall descend into the deep? (that is, to bring Christ up from the dead.) [8] But what saith it? The word is nigh unto thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart: that is, the word of faith, which we preach; [9] because if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. [10] For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. [11] For the scripture saith, Whosoever believeth on him shall not be put to shame. [12] For there is no distinction between Jew and Greek: for the same is Lord over all, being rich unto all them that call upon him: [13] For every one whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord, shall be saved. [14] How then shall they call on him in whom they have not

believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? [15] and how shall they preach, except they be sent? as it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that bring glad tidings of peace, that bring glad tidings of good things! [16] Howbeit they did not all hearken to the glad tidings. For Isaiah saith, Lord, who hath believed our report? [17] So then faith cometh of hearing, and hearing through the word of God. [18] But I say, Did they not hear? Nay verily, Their voice went out into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world. [19] But I say, Did Israel not know? First Moses saith, I will provoke you to jealousy against that which is not a nation, against a nation that hath no understanding will I anger you. [20] But Isaiah is very bold and saith, I was found by them that sought me not; I became manifest unto them that asked not after me. [21] But in regard of Israel he saith, all the day long did I stretch forth my hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying people.

CHAPTER XI.

I SAY then, Did God cast away his people? God forbid. For I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin. [2] God did not cast away his people which he foreknew. Know ye not what the scripture saith in [the history of] Elijah? how he pleadeth with God against Israel, [saying,] [3] Lord, they have killed thine prophets, they have digged down thine altars, and I only am left, and they seek my life. [4] Nevertheless what saith the answer of God unto him? I have reserved to myself seven thousand men, who have not bowed the knee to Baal. [5] Even so then in this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace. [6] Now if it is by grace, it is no more of works: for [otherwise] grace becometh no more grace. [7] What then? That which Israel seeketh for, he found not; but the election found it, and the rest were hardened [8] (according as it is written, God gave them a spirit of stupor, eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear;) unto this very day. [9] And David saith, Let their table be made a snare, and a trap, and a stumblingblock, and a recompense unto them: [10] Let their eyes be darkened that they may not see, and ever bow thou down their back. [11] I say then, Did they stumble in order that they should fall? God forbid: but by their

trespass salvation is come unto the Gentiles, for to provoke them to jealousy. [12] But if their trespass be the riches of the world, and their diminishing the riches of the Gentiles, how much more their fulness? [13] For I am speaking to you, Gentiles: inasmuch therefore as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I glorify mine office. [14] If by any means I may provoke to jealousy mine own flesh, and may save some of them. [15] For if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead? [16] Moreover if the firstfruit be holy, so also is the lump: and if the root be holy, so also are the branches. [17] But if some of the branches were broken off, and thou, being a wild olive, was graffed in among them, and wast made partaker of the root and fatness of the olive tree; [18] boast not against the branches. But and if thou boastest against them, it is not thou that bearest the root, but the root thee. [19] Thou wilt say then, The branches were broken off, that I might be graffed in. [20] Well; because of their unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by thy faith. Be not high-minded, but fear: [21] for if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he spare not thee also. [22] Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God: toward them which fell, severity; but toward thee, God's goodness, if thou continue in his goodness; for [otherwise] thou shalt also be cut off. [23] Yea and they, if they continue not in their unbelief, shall be graffed in: for God is able to graff them in again. [24] For if thou wast cut off from the olive tree which is by nature wild, and wast graffed contrary to nature into a good olive tree: how much more shall these, which be the natural branches, be graffed into their own olive tree? [25] For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest ye thould be wise in your own conceits; that hardness is come upon Israel in part, until the fulness of the Gentiles come in: [26] and thus all Israel shall be saved: even as it is written, Out of Zion shall come the Deliverer; he shall turn away ungodlinesses from Jacob: [27] and this is the covenant from me unto them, when I take away their sins. [28] As touching the gospel, they are enemies for your sakes: but as touching the election, they are beloved for the fathers' sakes: [29] for the gifts and the calling of God can not be repented of. [30] For as ye in times past were disobedient to God, yet now, by the disobedience of these have obtained mercy: [31] even so have these also now been

disobedient, that by the mercy shewn to you, they also may obtain mercy. [32] For God hath shut up all in disobedience, that he may have mercy upon all. [33] O the depth of the riches and wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out! [34] For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counselor? [35] or who hath first given to him, and shall have recompense made unto him again? [36] For of him, and through him, and unto him, are all things: to him be glory for ever. Amen.

CHAPTER XII.

I BESEECH you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, wellpleasing unto God, which is your rational service; [2] and not to be conformed to this world, but to be transfigured by the renewing of your mind, that ye may discern what is the good, and wellpleasing, and perfect will of God. [3] For I say, through the grace given unto me, to every man that is among you, not to be high minded above that which he ought to be, but to be minded so as to be sober minded, according as God hath dealt to each his measure of faith. [4] For as in one body we have many members, but the members have not all the same office: [5] so we, being many, are one body in Christ, and severally members one of another; [6] and having gifts differing according to the grace given to us, whether [we have] prophecy, [let us prophesy] according to the proportion of our faith; [7] or ministry, [let us be occupied] in our ministry: or he that teacheth, in his teaching; [8] or he that exhorteth, in his exhortation: he that giveth [let him do it] with liberality; he that ruleth, with diligence; he that sheweth mercy, with cheerfulness. [9] Let your love be unfeigned. Abhor that which is evil; cleave to that which is good. [10] In love of the brethren, be affectionate one to another; in giving honor, outdoing one another; [11] in diligence, not slothful; in spirit, fervent; serving the Lord; [12] in hope, rejoicing; in tribulation, patient; in prayer, persevering. [13] Communicating to the necessities of the saints; given to hospitality. [14] Bless them which persecute you: bless, and curse not. [15] Rejoice with them that do rejoice; weep with them that weep: [16] being of the same mind one toward another: not minding high things, but inclining unto the things that be lowly. Be not wise in your own conceits. [17] Recompense to no man evil for evil. Provide things honorable in the sight of

all men. [18] If it be possible, as much as dependeth on you, be at peace with all men. [19] Avenge not yourselves, dearly beloved, but give place unto the wrath [of God]: for it is written, Vengance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord. [20] If therefore thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink: for by so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head. [21] Be not overcome by evil, but overcome evil with good.

CHAPTER XIII.

Let every soul submit himself to the authorities that are above him: for there is no authority except from God: those that be have been ordained by God. [2] So that he which setteth himself against the authority, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves condemnation. [3] For rulers are not a terror to the good work, but to the evil. Dost thou desire not to be afraid of the authority? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise from the same: [4] for he is God's minister unto thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he weareth not the sword in vain: for he is God's minister, an avenger for wrath unto him that doeth evil. [5] Wherefore ye must needs submit yourselves, not only because of the wrath, but also for your conscience sake. [6] For for this cause ye also pay tribute: for they are ministers of God, attending continually to this very thing. [7] Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor. [8] Owe no man any thing, except to love one another: for he that loveth his neighbor hath fulfilled the law. [9] For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. [10] Love worketh no ill to his neighbor: love therefore is the fulfillment of the law. [11] And this, knowing the time, that now it is high time for us to awake out of sleep: for now is salvation nearer to us than when we [first] believed. [12] The night is far spent, the day is at hand: let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armor of light. [13] Let us walk seemly, as in the day; not in reveling and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying. [14] But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and take no forethought for the flesh, to [fulfill] the lusts [thereof].

CHAPTER XIV.

HIM that is weak in faith receive ye, [yet] not for the deciding of doubts. [2] One man believeth that he may eat all things: but he that is weak eateth herbs. [3] Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; neither let him that eateth not judge him that eateth: for God hath received him. [4] Who art thou that judgest the servant of another? to his own lord he standeth or falleth. But he shall be made to stand: for God is able to make him stand. [5] One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day. Let each be fully persuaded in his own mind. [6] He that regardeth the day, regardeth it to the Lord: he that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth thanks unto God: and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth thanks unto God. [7] For none of us liveth to himself, and none dieth to himself. [8] For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; and whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live, therefore, or die, we are the Lord's. [9] For to this end Christ died, and lived [again], that he might be Lord both of the dead and of the living. [10] But thou, why judgest thou thy brother? And again, thou, why despisest thou thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of God: [11] for it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall make confession to God. [12] So then each one of us shall give account concerning himself to God. [13] Therefore let us not judge one another any more: but let this rather be your judgment, not to put a stumblingblock or an occasion of falling in a brother's way. [14] I know, and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus, that nothing is unclean of itself: only to him that accounteth any thing unclean, to him it is unclean. [15] For if because of meat thy brother is grieved, thou art no longer walking according to love. Destroy not by thy meat him for whom Christ died. [16] Let not then your good be evil spoken of: [17] for the kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. [18] For he that herein serveth Christ is well-pleasing to God, and approved of men. [19] Let us therefore follow after the things of peace, and the things which pertain unto mutual edification. [20] Do not for the sake of meat undo the work of God. All things indeed are clean; nevertheless it is evil to the man who eateth with offense. [21] It is good not to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor [to do] any thing wherein thy brother

stumbleth, or is offended, or is weak. [22] Hast thou faith? have it to thyself before God. Blessed is he that judgeth not himself in that which he alloweth. [23] But he that doubteth is condemned if he eat, because [he eateth] not of faith: and whatsoever is not of faith, is sin.

CHAPTER XV.

Moreover we that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves. [2] Let every one of us please his neighbor for his good with a view to edification. [3] For Christ also pleased not himself; but, as it is written, The reproaches of them that reproached thee fell on me. [4] For whatsoever things were written aforetime, were written for our instruction, that through the patience and the comfort of the scriptures we might have our hope. [5] And may the God of patience and comfort grant you to be of the same mind one toward another according to Christ Jesus: [6] that with one accord ye may with one mouth glorify the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. [7] Wherefore receive ye one another, as Christ also received you, to the glory of God. [8] For I say that Jesus Christ hath been made a minister of the circumcision, for the sake of God's truth, in order to confirm the promises made unto the fathers: [9] and that the Gentiles glorify God for his mercy; as it is written, For this cause I will give thanks unto thee among the Gentiles, and will sing unto thy name. [10] And again he saith, Rejoice, ye Gentiles, with his people. [11] And again, Praise the Lord, all ye Gentiles; and laud him, all ye people. [12] And again, Isaiah saith, There shall be the root of Jesse, and he that riseth to rule over the Gentiles; in him shall the Gentiles hope: [13] And may the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope by the power of the Holy Ghost. [14] Now I am persuaded, my brethren, even I myself, concerning you, that ye also yourselves are full of goodness, filled with all knowledge, able also to admonish one another. [15] Howbeit I have written more boldly unto you, brethren, in some measure, as putting you in mind, because of the grace given to me by God, [16] that I should be a minister of Christ Jesus unto the Gentiles, ministering as a priest in the gospel of God, that the offering up of the Gentiles may be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost. [17] I have then my boasting in Christ Jesus in the things which pertain to God. [18] For I will not dare to speak at all save of those things

which Christ wrought by me, in order to the obedience of the Gentiles, by word and deed, [19] in the power of signs and wonders, in the power of the Holy Spirit; so that from Jerusalem and round about as far as Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ: [20] yet on this wise making it my ambition to preach the gospel, not where Christ was [already] named, that I might not build upon another man's foundation: [21] but according as it is written, They to whom no tidings of him came shall see: and they that have not heard shall understand. [22] For which cause also for the most part I was hindered from coming to you. [23] But now no more having place in these parts, and having these many years a longing to come unto you; [24] whensoever I take my journey into Spain, [I will come to you]: for I hope to see you as I pass through, and to be set forward on my journey thither by you, if first I be in some measure filled with your company. [25] But now I go unto Jerusalem, ministering unto the saints. [26] For Macedonia and Achaia have thought good to make a certain contribution for the poor among the saints which are at Jerusalem. [27] They have thought it good, and [indeed] they are their debtors. For if the Gentiles have been partakers in their spiritual things, they owe it [to them] also to minister unto them in carnal things. [28] When therefore I have performed this, and have secured to them this fruit, I will return by you into Spain. [29] And I know that, when I come unto you, I shall come in the fulness of the blessing of Christ. [30] Now I beseech you, brethren, by our Lord Jesus Christ, and by the love of the Spirit, to strive together with me in your prayers for me to God; [31] that I may be delivered from them that are disobedient in Judea; and that my ministration which is for Jerusalem may prove acceptable to the saints; [32] that I may come unto you in joy by the will of God, and may with you find rest. [33] Now the God of peace be with you all. Amen.

CHAPTER XVI.

I COMMEND unto you Phebe our sister, which is a deaconess of the church which is at Cenchreæ: [2] that ye receive her in the Lord, so as becometh saints, and that ye assist her in whatsoever business she may have need of you: for she too hath been a succorer of many, and of myself also. [3] Salute Prisca and Aquila my fellow-laborers in Christ Jesus: [4] who for my life laid down their own necks: unto whom not only I give thanks, but also all

the churches of the Gentiles. [5] Likewise [salute] the church that is in their house. Salute Epænetus, my wellbeloved, who is the firstfruits of Asia unto Christ. [6] Salute Mary, which bestowed much labor on us. [7] Salute Andronicus and Junia, my kinsmen, and my fellow-prisoners, which are of note among the apostles, which also were in Christ before me. [8] Salute Amplias my beloved in the Lord. [9] Salute Urbanus, our fellow-laborer in Christ, and Stachys, my beloved. [10] Salute Apelles the approved in Christ. Salute them that be of the household of Aristobulus. [11] Salute Herodion, my kinsman. Salute them of the household of Narcissus, which are in the Lord. [12] Salute Tryphena and Tryphosa, who labor in the Lord. Salute Persis the beloved, which labored much in the Lord. [13] Salute Rufus the elect in the Lord, and [her who is] his mother and mine. [14] Salute Asyncritus, Phlegon, Hermes, Patrobas, Hermas, and the brethren which are with them. [15] Salute Philologus, and Julia, Nereus, and his sister, and Olympas, and all the saints which are with them. [16] Salute one another with an holy kiss. All the churches of Christ salute you. [17] Now I beseech you, brethren, to mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye learned; and avoid them. [18] For they that are such serve not our Lord Christ, but their own belly; and by their good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple. [19] For your obedience is come abroad unto all men. I rejoice therefore over you: yet I would have you wise unto that which is good, and harmless unto that which is evil. [20] And the God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you. [21] Timotheus my fellow-laborer saluteth you, and Lucius, and Jason, and Sosipater, my kinsmen. [22] I Tertius, who wrote the epistle, salute you in the Lord. [23] Gaius mine host, and [the host] of the whole church, saluteth you. Erastus the treasurer of the city saluteth you, and Quartus our brother. [24] The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen. [25] Now to him that is able to stablish you according to my gospel and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery, which hath been kept in silence during eternal ages, [26] but now is made manifest, and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, is made known to all nations unto obedience of faith: [27] to the only wise God through Jesus Christ; to whom be the glory for ever. Amen.

THE DOCTRINES OF CHRISTIANITY THE TRUE SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEMS OF NATURAL RELIGION.*

BY M. GUIZOT.

THERE are certain words which have come to be regarded with distrust and alarm. We suspect them of covering illegitimate and tyrannical demands. Such in our day is the fortune of the word *doctrine;* which to many minds conveys the idea of an imperious necessity of believing what wounds and disquiets them. Thus, by a singular contrast, while we every-where are searching after fundamental truths, we dread doctrines.

Although in itself irrational, this feeling is not to be wondered at. The doctrines of Christianity have served as a motive or pretext for so much iniquity, oppression, and cruelty, that the name has become tainted and suspected. The word is burdened with the painful memories it revives, and which history confirms. Every blow at liberty of conscience, every employment of force to extirpate or to impose religious belief, is, and has always been, wicked and tyrannical. All governments, parties, and Churches have believed such acts not only to be permitted, but commanded. All have believed themselves not only to have the right, but to be under obligation, to prevent and punish error in religion by human law and force. They can all allege in excuse their sincere faith in the legitimacy of this usurpation. Still, the usurpation is none the less enormous and fatal, and it is, perhaps, of all human usurpations, that which has inflicted on mankind the most odious miseries and disorders. Its abandonment will be the glory of our time. But it still survives, and exists in certain countries, in certain laws, in certain corners of society, and of Christian souls. In order to secure its absolute banishment, and to prevent its return, watchfulness and effort are, and will always be, required. Nevertheless it is vanquished; civil liberty, in matters of faith and the religious life, is now a fundamental principle of civilization and law. It is not in the arena of legislation and by the hand of public authority, but only in the sphere of intellect and by the free activity of mind,

---

*Translated from the *Revue Chrétienne*, July, 1864.

that the questions which touch the relations of man with God are to be debated and decided.

But, within this sphere, these questions imperatively demand a solution. They call for the primitive facts, and the fundamental ideas, or, in other words, for the first truths in the case. The Christian religion has its own principles, which consist in the rational foundations of the faith it inculcates and the life it requires. These it terms its doctrines. The doctrines of Christianity are the principles of the Christian religion and the Christian solution of the problems of natural religion.

It becomes thoughtful men, who have not declared war to the knife against the Christian faith, and who admire it, although rejecting its fundamental doctrines, to take heed: the flowers whose perfume charms them, will quickly wither—the fruits which they find so excellent, will soon disappear, if once the roots of the tree which bears them are cut away.

For myself, at the close of a long life, filled with labor, reflection, and experiences—experiences in thought as well as action—I am firmly convinced that the doctrines of Christianity are the legitimate and successful solutions of the problems of natural religion exhibited in man himself, and from which he can not escape.

Let me, at the outset, crave the pardon of the theologians, both Catholic and Protestant. I do not propose to state, explain, or defend all the doctrinal points, all the articles of faith, which they denominate Christian doctrines. For eighteen centuries Christian theology has often ventured beyond the Christian religion. Men have mingled their own work with the work of God. This is the natural consequence of the union of human activity with human imperfection. It every-where appears in the history of the world, especially in the history of the society and the religion on which God grafted the Christian faith. When Jesus Christ was raised up by Him among the Jews, the faith and the law of the Jews were no longer simply the faith and the law which God had given to them by Moses. The Pharisees, Sadducees, and others had radically modified, extended, and altered them. Christianity also has had its Pharisees and its Sadducees; in its turn it has experienced the influence of human thought and passion employed upon Divine revelation. The results of these labors are so uncertain, that I do not concede to them the right to claim to be regarded as Christian doctrines. At present, however, I do not propose to

designate or combat then views which, in the Church and in Christian theology, I neither accept nor defend. It does not become me, and I venture to say it does not become any Christian, to criticise the inner partitions of the edifice when its foundations are fiercely assailed. I would much rather rally in the common defense all who dwell beneath its roof, and will, therefore, speak only of the doctrines which are common to them all. They may all be comprehended under the terms, Creation, Providence, Original Sin, Incarnation, and Redemption. These truths constitute the essence of the Christian religion, and to me, whoever believes them, is Christian.

One grand and common characteristic of these doctrines strikes me at the outset: they grapple with and plainly solve the problems of natural religion inherent in man. The doctrine of Creation attests the existence of God the creator and law-giver, and of the bond which unites man to God. The doctrine of Providence explains and justifies prayer—the instinctive repairing of man to the living God, to the supreme power which attends his life and presides over his lot. The doctrine of Original Sin accounts for the presence of evil and disorder in man and in the world. The doctrines of the Incarnation and Redemption deliver man from the consequences of evil, and open to him, in another life, the perspectives of the reëstablishment of order. Unquestionably the system is grand, complete, coherent, mighty. It responds to the cries of the human soul for deliverance from the heavy burden which rests upon it, and imparts to it, along with the forces it needs, the satisfaction to which it aspires. Has it a right to so much power? Is it legitimate as well as successful?

I have felt the weight of the objections to the Christian system and to each of its essential doctrines. I have known the anxieties of doubt. I will state why I am free from it—on what my convictions are founded.

I. Creation.

Those only would be serious adversaries to the doctrine of Creation who should say that the universe, the earth, and the human race which inhabits it, have been, in all respects, and from all eternity, what they now are. But no one will venture such an assertion; it is contrary to undeniable facts. The question has been much discussed, and is still in debate, how many ages man has

lived on the earth. The answer, whatever it may be, does not affect the doctrine of Creation; for it is certain, and is not even denied, that man has not always existed on the earth, and that it was for a long time in various states incompatible with the existence of the human race. Man, therefore, has had a beginning; man has come upon the earth. How came he there?

On this point the adversaries of the doctrine of Creation are divided; some embracing the theory of spontaneous generation, others the transformation of species. According to the former, matter possesses, in certain circumstances, and by the simple development of its own proper forces, the power of creating animate existences. According to the other class, the different species of living beings which have existed at different periods, past and present, and in different states of the earth, are the product of a small number of primitive types, which have had, thanks to the millions or billions of ages, the power of developing and perfecting themselves in such a manner as to transform themselves into superior species. Hence they conclude, more or less timidly, that the human race is the result of a transformation, or of a series of similar transformations.

As to the system of spontaneous generation, the attempt to establish it is of long standing. But science has always disowned it. The more exact and profound its observations, the more emphatic its rejection of the hypothesis of the creative power of matter. Quite recently, the question, once more attentively studied by men of eminence within and without the Academy of Sciences, has terminated in the same conclusion. But even if it were otherwise; even if the defenders of spontaneous generation should be able to appeal to certain experiments in which we could not at once detect the error, the original appearance of man upon the earth would none the better be explained on this theory, and I should have none the less the right to repeat what I have elsewhere said upon this subject:*

"In this mode of production there could never have been produced any thing beyond infant human beings, at the first hour and in the first stage of nascent life. No one, I believe, has ever said, and none ever will say, that in the process of a spontaneous gen-

---

* *L'Eglise et la Societé Chrétienne en* 1861, p. 27.

eration, man—that is to say, man and woman, the human pair—could have come forth, and that they did come forth some day, from matter, fully formed and full-grown, in complete possession of their hight, strength, and all their faculties, as the Greek paganism represented Minerva to have sprung from the brain of Jupiter. It is nevertheless on this condition alone that, in appearing for the first time on earth, man could have lived, had offspring, and founded the human race. Let any one figure to himself the first man coming into existence in the state of early infancy; alive, but unable to walk, without intelligence or strength, incapable of taking care of himself a single instant, shivering and crying, with no mother to hear and suckle him! Yet this is the only first man which the system of spontaneous generation is able to give us! Evidently it was not in any such way that the human race made its first appearance on earth."

The theory of the *transmutation of species* is no less repugnant to science than to the instincts of good sense. It rests upon no established fact, on no data furnished by scientific observation or historical tradition. All the facts proved, all the monuments gathered in different ages, and different places, which have any bearing on the existence of species now living, show that they have undergone no transformation, no considerable or permanent change; we find them a thousand, two thousand, three thousand years ago, what they are to-day. In any particular species, the races may vary, or become modified one by another; but species never change. And when the attempt has been made to transform them artificially, by crossings between kindred species, nothing has been obtained but modifications, which, after two or three generations, have become barren, as if to show the impotence of man to accomplish, by the progressive transformation of existing species, the creation of new species. Man is not a monkey transformed and perfected by an obscure fermentation of natural elements and the power of time. This pretended explanation of the origin of the human race is nothing but an hypothesis, the issue of an imagination easily seduced by ingenious conjectures suggested to it by the spectacle of nature ill understood, and which it scatters across the unknown events, and the boundless periods on which it imposed the burden of realizing its dreams. The principle of the radical diversity and the permanence of species, firmly maintained by M.

Cuvier, M. Flourens, M. Coste, M. de Quatrefages, and all severe observers of facts, is still dominant in science as it is in nature.*

These idle attempts to set God the Creator aside, and to explain, by the inherent and progressive forces of matter, the origin of man and of the world, do not stand alone: the Christian doctrine of creation is assailed with other objections. The account which the Bible gives of the successive stages of creation by which the world and man were produced, is disputed, and the difficulties of harmonizing the account with the observations and results of science, are arrayed and dwelt upon. I shall consider the value of this class of objections in treating of the inspiration of the sacred books, and exhibiting its real object and legitimate signification. But at present, in giving to the doctrine of creation its own prominence and isolation, I raise it above the level of the assault; that which constitutes the doctrine is the general fact, the first principle, indeed, of creation. Whatever may be the obscurities or scientific difficulties of the Biblical narrative, the fact and truth are none the less sure: God the Creator remains none the less in possession of his work. The Christian religion, in its essence, affirms and requires nothing more.

We have still to consider the general objection against the Christian doctrine of creation, which denies all the facts which we call supernatural; that is to say, the existence of God as well as the doctrine of creation, all religions as well as the Christian. A question like this is not to be treated with reference simply to a particular doctrine, and in order to defend merely one side of the Christian edifice. I will grapple with it at once, and in its whole extent.

II. Providence.

God the Creator is also God the Preserver. He lives at the same time that he makes alive. The bond between Him and his creature does not disappear as soon as the latter is created. Next to the doctrine of creation comes that of providence.

---

* Cuvier, Discours sur les Revolutions du Globe, p. 117–124 (edition of 1825). Flourens, Ontologie Naturelle, 1861, p. 10–87;—Journal des Savants, Oct., Nov., and Dec., 1863, three articles on Darwin's Origin of Species. Coste, Histoire générale et particuliére du développement des corps organisés, T. i, p. 23. Quatrefages, Métamorphoses de l'homme et des animaux, 1862, p. 225, and his articles on the Unity of the Human Race, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1860 and 1861, republished in one volume, 12mo., 1861.

There is in prayer something beyond the desires or yearnings of the soul after the satisfaction, strength, or consolation which it does not find in itself: it is the expression of faith, instinctive or voluntary, obscure or clear, wavering or firm, in the existence, presence, power, and sympathy of the Being to whom prayer is addressed. Without a certain measure of faith and hope in God, prayer either does not spring up, or else it suddenly withers in the soul. If it resists, and every-where survives, as it does, all the denials, doubts, and darkness which beset the human race, it is because the human race bears within itself an indestructible sentiment of the permanent bond which unites it to God, and God to it.

Far from destroying that sentiment, the experience and the spectacle of life explain and confirm it. Man, in reflecting on his destination, recognizes the facts which determine it as springing from three distinct sources, and forming, so to speak, three classes. He is subject to events which are the consequences of general laws, permanent and independent of his will, but which his intelligence observes and comprehends. He is himself, by the act of his own free will, the conscious author of events which enter, in their consequences, into the tissue of his life. He is acted upon by events which, so far as he can see, are neither the inevitable result of general laws, nor the product of his own free will. They are events of which he discerns neither the cause nor the reason.

Mankind attribute this last kind of events, sometimes to a blind cause which they call chance, and sometimes to an intelligent and supreme intention, which is God. And when the mind revolts at the folly of this word *chance*, which explains nothing, and means nothing, it imagines some mysterious and impenetrable force, which is simply a necessary series of unknown facts, and which it calls fatality, destiny. To account for this obscure and accidental part of human life, which depends neither upon cognizable general laws, nor upon the free will of the individual, we must make our choice between fatality or providence, chance or God.

My own conviction I have no hesitation in expressing. Whoever embraces fatality and chance as explanations, does not really believe in God. Whoever really believes in God relies on providence. God is not an expedient, invented to explain the first fact; an actor called to open the scene by creating the world, and then consigned to a state of absolute quiescence and torpor. In virtue of the fact, solely, that he is, God is present at his work and

upholds it. Providence is the natural and necessary development of the existence of God: it is the constant presence and permanent action of God in creation. The universal and undying instinct which impels man to prayer is in harmony with this ultimate fact: he who believes in God can not but have recourse to him in prayer.

Objections are made even to the name, God. He acts, it is said, only by general and permanent laws: why ask of him special and accidental volitions? He is immutable; always perfect, and always the same. Why imagine that he accommodates himself to the varying moods of human feeling and desire? Prayer presented to him is in forgetfulness of what he is. The nature of God is the contradiction of his providence.

This objection, so often repeated, I can not hear without astonishment. The larger part of those who make it, affirm, at the same time, that God is incomprehensible, and that we can not penetrate the secret of his nature. What, then, do they do, except to pretend to know God? and by what right do they put his nature in opposition to his providence, if his nature is for us an inscrutable mystery? I do not mean to make their ambition a matter of reproach; it is the privilege and the glory of man: but in preserving it, let him not forget the limits of his power. We must make our election; we must either cease to believe in God, because we can not comprehend him, or else we must acknowledge, indeed, that we can not comprehend him, and yet believe in him. We may not pass incessantly from one system to the other, and sometimes declare God to be incomprehensible, and sometimes treat of Him, his nature and attributes, as if he stood within the sphere of human knowledge. Great as may be the question of providence, that on which I here touch is greater, for it is the question of the very existence of God; the question, at the bottom, whether He is, or is not. God is at once light and mystery, in intimate relation with man, and yet above the reach of his knowledge. I will endeavor, hereafter, to point out the limit of human knowledge, and its true domain; but at present I assume so much as certain, viz.: whoever, believing in God, and calling Him incomprehensible, persists, nevertheless, in endeavoring to define Him scientifically, and wishes to penetrate the mystery after having admitted its existence, incurs a great risk of destroying his own belief, and reducing God to a nullity, which is one way of denying Him.

This double fact, the impossibility of comprehending God in connection with the necessity of believing on Him, I now leave for a moment, and come directly to the objection made against the doctrine of a special providence; viz., that which is based on the general character of the laws of nature. This objection arises from confounding things the most diverse, and forgetting a fundamental and characteristic fact of human nature. It is, certainly, by general laws that the Providence of God directs the course of the world. It would be more correct to give these general laws another name. They are the permanent will of God, continuously acting on the world: for the legislator, like his laws, is always present in the world. But when God created man, he made him not like the material world, but a free moral agent; and, hence, is necessitated a radical difference in the kind of agency which he exerts upon man and upon the material world. I shall show hereafter what is, in my view, the full import of the proposition that man is a free agent, and its necessary consequences. For the present, I take the freedom of man, his free determinations in his moral acts, as a certain and undeniable fact. This being admitted, it will not do to say that God governs man altogether by general and permanent laws; for that would be to ignore and abolish liberty as a part of man's life; *i. e.*, to ignore and mutilate the work of God. Man determines freely, and so effectuates, in his own proper life, events which are not the result of general laws exterior to himself. Divine Providence takes cognizance of human liberty. It does not manage men as it does the stars of heaven, and the waves of the ocean, which neither think nor will. It has different relations with man and with nature, and a different mode of acting upon them.

I know it is not wise to compare objects and facts which are not really analogous. Men have so often given distorted views of God, by representing him after the image of man, that I distrust every idea derived from the nature of man and applied to God. I can not, however, forget that God made man in his own image, nor can I abstain altogether from seeking in the life of man some faint reflection of the attributes of God. How is it in the human family? The father and the mother while managing the child recognize his active development. They watch over him with authority and with tenderness. Without destroying his liberty, they give that liberty rules and limits. They hear his

prayers, and sometimes grant and at others refuse them, just as reason dictates, and in view of his general and future interest. The child, on his part, without premeditation or design, but by the spontaneous instinct of his nature, recognizes the authority and feels the tenderness of his parents. In the course of his development, he obeys and resists them in turn, using his natural liberty well or ill; but, through all these troubles of the will, he asks and prays with confidence, joyful and grateful when he receives from them, and ready to ask and beg again when he has been refused, and always with confidence. Such are the facts in the natural and good government of the family.

And they are the imperfect but true image, the obscure and yet faithful shadowing forth of Divine Providence. The Christian doctrine of Providence presents and describes the action of God on the life of man qualified in just this way. It represents God as always present and accessible to men, as the father is to the child. It exhorts, encourages, invites men to pray to God and trust in him. It reserves to God absolutely the answer to prayer. He bestows or denies. We may not see into his reasons, for "God's ways are not our ways." But yet with prayer "without ceasing" the Christian doctrine always connects *hope;* for "nothing is impossible with God." The Christian doctrine of Providence is in full and intimate harmony with the nature of man. In recognizing his liberty, it does homage to his greatness; in giving to him access to God in prayer, it provides for his weakness. As a question of science, it leaves the mystery as one incapable of solution; but in actual life and experience, it resolves the problem of natural religion which burdens the soul.

III. Original Sin.

The doctrines of Creation and Providence place us in the presence of God; for they affirm and proclaim the action of God on the world and on man. The doctrine of Original Sin brings us back to man; for it places an act of man toward God at the head of the history of the human race.

What is this doctrine? What are its elements—the essential facts on which it is founded and in which it consists?

The doctrine of Original Sin implies and affirms, 1. That God in creating man made him a moral, free, and fallible being; 2. That the will of God is the moral law of man, and obedience to

the will of God the duty of man as a free moral being; 3. That by an act of his own free will, man knowingly failed of his duty by disobeying the law of God: 4. That man being free, is responsible, and that, therefore, his disobedience to the law of God justly drew down upon him chastisement; 5. That the responsibility and punishment of sin are hereditary, and that the sin of the first man has rested, and still rests, upon the race.

The authority of God, the duty of obedience to the law of God, the liberty and responsibility of man, the hereditary transmission of this responsibility—these are, in their moral chronology, the elements and facts comprehended in the doctrine of Original Sin.

I pass by now, for a moment, the doctrine itself, its source, its history, and the biblical and Christian teachings concerning the first step in evil of the human race, and simply look at man, his nature, and destiny as they actually are. Let me carefully state the moral facts just as they occur, and as, independently to the disputes of the learned, they appear to men of common sense.

Man is subjected, at his birth, to the moral authority as well as to the physical power of those who, in a subordinate sense, are his creators. Obedience to these is to him a duty, and, at the same time, a necessity. This physical necessity and this moral obligation are not identical, though intimately connected; and, in his spontaneous development, the infant instinctively feels the moral obligation much sooner than he reflects upon the physical necessity. The instinct of obligation unites itself to the rising sentiment of affection, and the child obeys the look or the voice of the mother without knowing, as yet, that he can not do without her.

Just as the sentiment of affection and the instinct of obligatory obedience are the first flash of moral good in the development of the child, so the impulse of disobedience is the first symptom and appearance of moral evil. It is by voluntary disobedience to the will of his mother that the violation of duty begins with the child, and it is in disobedience that it consists. The child takes no account either of the motives or of the consequences of his acts. He only knows that he disobeys, and he regards his mother with a mingled sentiment of defiance and distrust. He feels the mother's authority as he hesitates in the act of disobedience. He tries to be and especially to appear

independent, in face of the natural and lawful authority which governs him, and which he recognizes in the very act of setting up his own will in opposition to that superior law.

What the child is, such is the man. As the child is born free, so man lives free; and as he is born, so he lives, subject to authority. Liberty exists by the side of authority, and resists without abolishing its claim. Authority exists before liberty, and neither gives way to it nor crushes it. Man renders homage to authority when disobeying it, for he knows that he disobeys. Authority does homage to the liberty of man by condemning him for having made bad use of it; for he would not be responsible for his acts if he were not free. The coexistence of these two powers, viz., authority and liberty—their alternate harmony and discord—this is the great fact of human nature and of human destiny, the fundamental fact of man and of the world.

I speak here of the moral world, the world of thought and will. In the material world there is neither authority nor liberty; there are only *forces*, and these necessary and unequal. If I were now speaking of the material world, I could only repeat what was excellently said by Pascal: "Man is nothing but a reed, the most feeble in nature; but he is a reed that *thinks*. It is not necessary that the whole universe should arm itself in order to crush him. A breath of vapor, a drop of water is enough to destroy him. But if the universe should crush him, man would yet be more noble than his destroyer, because conscious of dying, while the universal world knows nothing of its triumph." When man obeys or disobeys, he knows that authority is over him and liberty is in him. He knows what he does, and he is responsible for it. The moral order is there complete in all its elements.

At all times, then, and in all places, in the case of all men, as well as in that of the first man, disobedience to lawful authority is the principle and element of moral evil, or, to call it by its name in religion, of *sin*.

Disobedience has different and complex sources. It may spring from the desire of independence, from ambition or proud curiosity, from the indulgence of particular inclinations and appetites; but, in all cases, it is disobedience which is and remains the essential character of the free act which constitutes the sin, and is the foundation of the responsibility with which it is accompanied.

Distinguished men, and eminent, too, for piety, have denied the liberty of man. Not knowing how to reconcile with it Divine foreknowledge, so called, they have rejected the fundamental fact pertaining to the nature of man, rather than frankly confess the mystery of the nature of God. Another class, made up also of eminent and sincere men, have taken a position of *doubt* in respect to human liberty, and refuse to regard its existence as an absolute and undeniable fact. They have, I think, confounded operations essentially different, though intimately related. They have failed to recognize the simple act of the free will as distinct from other mental acts. Having had occasion, thirty-five years ago in my course of lectures at the Sorbonne, on the history of civilization in France, to give a view of the controversy of St. Augustine with Pelagius on free will, predestination, and grace, I then expressed myself in terms which I repeat here, as I can find no others more full and precise: "The fact which lies at the foundation of the whole dispute is liberty—freedom of choice—the human will. In order to understand this fact accurately, it is necessary to disengage it from every foreign element, and look at it separate and alone. It is carelessness right here which has caused so much misunderstanding of the subject. Writers have viewed and described it, jumbled, so to speak, with other facts which are, indeed, closely connected with it in actual life, but which are, nevertheless, essentially distinct and different. They have, for example, made human liberty to consist in the act of deliberating and choosing between motives. This deliberation, and the judgment following it, have been taken as the essence of free will. But they do not belong to it at all. These are acts of intellect, not of liberty. It is before the tribunal of intellect that the diverse motives of resolution and action, such as interests, passions, opinions, and the like, are placed. It considers them, compares, weighs, and decides. This is a preparatory work *antecedent* to the act of willing, and constituting no part of it whatever. When deliberation has been had, when the man has taken full cognizance of the motives which offer themselves to him, and of their power, *then* follows a fact altogether new, altogether different—the fact of volition or free-will. The man makes a resolve; that is to say, he begins a series of acts which have their source in himself, of which he regards himself as the author, which were produced because he wills it, which would not be if he did not will it, which

would be different if he willed them to be different. Remove all recollection of the intellectual deliberation, and of the consideration and weighing of motives; concentrate your thoughts, and that of the man who makes a resolve, upon the precise moment when he says, 'I will,' and ask yourselves, ask him, if he would not be able to will and do otherwise. You and he will most surely answer yes. Here appears the fact of liberty. It resides wholly in the resolve which the man makes *after* deliberation; that resolve which is the proper act of the man himself, which exists through him, and him alone—an act simple, independent of all the facts which precede and surround it, the same in the most diverse circumstances, and whatever be its motives or its results.

"But while man thus feels himself free, and recognizes his power to begin, by his will alone, a series of facts, he, at the same time, finds that his will is placed under the control of a certain law, which takes different names according to the occasions on which it operates, as moral law, reason, good sense, etc. Man is free, but, properly speaking, his will is not arbitrary. He may use it in an absurd, unjust, culpable manner, and, whenever he uses it, a certain rule ought to direct its action. The observance of this rule is his duty, the business and task of his liberty."

It is this central special act of the free will, separate from its adjuncts, which, in the case of disobedience to the law of duty, constitutes sin, and brings upon the sinner the responsibility of his act.

Is this responsibility, now, strictly *personal* and limited to the actor? or is it communicated and transmitted, in a certain degree, to his descendants?

I proceed, as before, to consider and present actual facts apparent to observation, such as are continually occurring and showing themselves in the moral life of the human race.

There is found in the poetry and the mythology of almost all nations the idea of a past and primitive Utopia, which, under various names, as the golden age, the age of the gods, etc., they imagine as an epoch in which physical and moral evil did not exist in the world—an age of innocence, peace, and happiness. This Utopia is so much the more remarkable, as it has no foundation or pretext in the traditions of the oldest historic times. From the very commencement of history, from the first traces of precise and veritable historic facts, it is not a golden age which appears,

but, on the contrary, an iron age, an epoch of violent, ignorant barbarism, where war reigns, where force rules, and which has not the smallest resemblance to the beautiful dreams of the ancient poetry. I do not insist, at present, upon any connection between these mythological dreams and the traditions of the Bible. I draw no inference from the golden age in support of the garden of Eden. I only mark a fact, a general instinct of the human imagination. What is the meaning of it? Whence comes this Utopia of innocence and happiness in the very cradle of the race? This notion of a primitive time without strife, sin, and pain, to what is it a response?

I leave now the cradle of man and the primitive poetry; I come down to the present, to real life, to the cradle of the infant. Why are we so impelled, apart even from all personal affection, to call infancy the age of innocence? and why do we take such pleasure in giving it this name and in looking at it under this title? *Physical* evil is already there; it appears from the very entrance upon life. But *moral* evil has not yet shown itself. Life has not yet brought upon the soul its ordeals and excited its unholy feelings; and the idea of a soul without moral stain has an inexpressible charm. We experience a profound joy at seeing innocence, or at least its image, in the infant, while all around and within us we find it no more.

What means this universal instinct, which, whether in the dreams of imagination or in the most retired scenes of life, whether our minds are directed to the cradle of the race or to that of the infant, leads us to regard innocence as the primitive and normal state of man, and to locate, what some call Paradise and others the golden age, just where innocence is found?

Evidently it is because between the soul without a stain and the soul tainted with evil, between the creature who is only fallible and the creature who has actually fallen, there is an immense distance, an abyss, a profound change of condition. We have a secret conviction of this deplorable change—of the fall into this abyss; and, without premeditation, by the simple impulse of our nature, our thoughts pass over the abyss, and dwell with rapture on the state before the fall. This is the origin and explanation of the power and the charm which the idea of innocence has for us. We have never seen innocence, but we are permitted to conceive of it. It presents itself to us in the cradle of the world and in

that of the infant, and we take an infinite pleasure in its contemplation.

Is this pleasure unmixed with every personal feeling—is it free from all secret reference to ourselves—the pleasure of a simple spectator? No; these impressions, which excite in us the idea of innocence, return and draw us back to ourselves. This change of state, this mysterious event, which has thrown man so far from innocence, though leaving him its idea and almost adoring admiration, was experienced not only by the first man—it has also reached and continues to affect the whole race. The evil we suffer does not start with ourselves alone; we received it by inheritance before drawing it upon ourselves by our own sin. We are not only fallible creatures, we are children of a fallen being.

How can we be surprised at this sad inheritance? Have we not the example and spectacle every day before our eyes? It is an undeniable and undenied fact that there are two elements in the moral life of men, viz., first, his innate dispositions, his natural and involuntary inclinations, and, secondly, his own personal will. The natural propensities of the individual do not destroy his moral liberty, do not enslave his will. They only render the exercise of it more difficult and laborious. They are not a claim which binds him, but a burden to be borne. It is also both undeniable and undenied that these natural dispositions are various, and are unequally distributed among men. No one is entirely exempt from evil propensity. Every man is not only fallible but *prone* to fall, and that in some particular way. Lastly, it is another undeniable fact, although not so easily appreciated, that the natural and the special dispositions of the individual come, in a certain measure, from his origin, and that parents transmit to their children particular moral dispositions, or biases, just as they do particular physical temperaments and features. Hereditary transmission occurs in the moral as well as the material world. Yes, and it has place there, necessarily—has had place since the first day of man's existence on the earth; for man was created complete and in his whole nature. And since he was created fallible as well as complete, who, I ask, will measure the distance between man fallible, but, as yet, without fault, and the first actual sin? Who will sound the depth of his fall and of the change which it produced in his moral state? Who will weigh the consequences of this change on the condition and the moral dispositions of his descendants? To enable us to

appreciate the extent and importance of this fearful fact, of this first appearance and this first heritage of moral evil, we have but one indication; viz., the instinct which we retain of the state of innocence, and the immense distance which this instinct leads us, unavoidably, to place between native innocence and the first sin. But this indication is unanswerable. It makes us recognize, in this sad transformation, all the moral weakness and all the responsibility of the race.

Men cry out at the injustice of this. It is asked how each man can be responsible for a fault which he did not himself commit—for the sin of a man removed so many centuries from himself. I consider this a little and weak complaint. Men may as well complain of all the inequalities which exist between men, of the inequality of conditions as well as of natures, the inequality of moral dispositions as well as of physical powers. Let them complain of the connection and influence of successive generations, and of the control which the ideas, actions, and fortunes of each of them exert upon those of the generations which follow. Let them complain of the bonds which unite the child to his parent, and which cause him both to inherit their evil dispositions and to suffer for their faults. It is the universal law of the world that must be complained of. The existence of evil itself, and its unequal distribution, irrespective of the merit of individuals, will have to be arraigned as a monstrous iniquity. And when we come to this, when we refuse to admit as the source of evil the sin and responsibility of man, placed in this world in the midst of transition and trial, then the alternative which remains is this: We must either accept the evil as natural, eternal, necessary, in the future as well as in the past, the normal condition of man and the world; *i. e.*, we must deny God, creation, Divine Providence, morality, human liberty, responsibility, and hope; or else we must ascribe the evil in the world to God himself, and demand the reason for it from Him.

The doctrine of original sin alone frees the mind from this odious and intolerable alternative. Far from being in contradiction either with the history of humanity or with the facts and instincts which constitute the moral nature of man, this doctrine admits, illustrates, and explains them all. The fact of original sin has nothing in it strange or obscure. It consists essentially in disobedience to the will of God, which is the moral law of man. This disobedience, the sin of Adam, is an act which is committed

every-where and every day, from the same causes, and with the same characteristics and the same consequences, which are ascribed to it by the Christian system. To-day, as much as in the garden of Eden, this act has as its cause—the desire for absolute independence, a curious and proud ambition, and a weak yielding to temptation. To-day, as in the garden of Eden, it produces in the inward state of the man a mighty change, the mere idea of which seizes and troubles the human soul to its very center. It causes the man to pass from a state of innocence to a state of sin. To-day, as in the garden of Eden, the act which produces this change involves the responsibility not only of the actor, but also of his descendants. Sin is contagious in time as in space. As it spreads abroad, so it transmits itself onward. The Christian doctrine of original sin shows the first man created fallible, but born innocent—innocent at mature age and in the fullness of his faculties, a stranger to every evil and fatal heritage. Suddenly, for the first time, by his own proper will, man disobeys God. *There* is the original sin, the same in its nature as actual sin; for they both consist in disobedience to the law of God; but the first in date, and in the history of human liberty, is the human source of the evil, of which the Christian religion, at the same time that it points it out, offers to man the remedy and cure.

IV. The Incarnation.

All religions have given a large place to the problems of existence and of the origin of evil; all have tried to resolve them. Ormuzd and Ahriman, the good and the evil genius among the Persians; Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva, respectively the creating, preserving, and destroying deities in India; the Titans, struck down with thunderbolts when scaling Olympus; Prometheus, bound to a rock for having stolen fire from heaven, are so many hypotheses for explaining the contest between good and evil, between order and disorder, in the world and in man. But all these hypotheses are complicated, confused, and charged with wild fables; all of them derive evil from irrelevant causes, and none of them assign an end to the strife or furnish a remedy to the evil. The Christian religion alone both clearly presents and efficiently resolves the question. It alone imputes to man himself, and to him only, the origin of evil; it alone shows God interposing to raise man from his fall and save him from his ruin.

In the course of the sixth and seventh centuries before the coming of Christ, a great fact appears in history. A spirit of moral, social, and religious reform arose, and spread from East to West, among all the nations then most advanced in civilization. The most recent and thorough researches in chronology favor the conclusion, as the most probable, that Confucius, in China; the Buddha Sakya-Muni, in India; Zoroaster, in Persia; Pythagoras and Socrates, in Greece, all lived within that epoch.* These were characters as different as they are celebrated, who, by different methods, and in unequal degrees, undertook the great work of the reformation of man and of society in their day. Confucius was chiefly a practical moralist, shrewd in observation and skillful in counsel and discipline; the Buddha Sakya-Muni, a dreamer and a mystical popular preacher; Zoroaster, a legislator, at once religious and political; Pythagoras and Socrates, philosophers, who gathered around themselves and instructed select disciples. Though these men suffered trials and troubles, they certainly lacked, during their lives, neither power nor glory. Confucius and Zoroaster were favorites and counselors of kings. The Buddha Sakya-Muni, himself a king's son, became the idol of countless multitudes. Pythagoras and Socrates formed schools, and trained pupils who have been an honor to the human mind. By their personal genius, and the beauty of some of their doctrines and acts, these men have never ceased to be admired. Did they *do* what they said, and accomplish what they attempted? Did they actually change the moral and social state of their respective nations? Did they give to the race a great and manifest impulse in the direction of progress, and open to mankind horizons never known before? Not at all. Whatever eclat is connected with the names of these men; whatever influence they may have exerted; whatever trace of their lives may have remained after them, their power was more apparent than real. They acted more on the surface than at the foundation; they did not bring men out of the beaten tracks in which they found them; they did not change their hearts. All the facts, taken together, show that, notwithstanding all the political and material revolutions which these nations have undergone, China, after Confucius; India, after

* These researches place *Confucius*, B. C. 551–478; *Zoroaster*, 564–487, or 589–512; *Sakya-Muni*, in the seventh and sixth centuries before Christ (he died, according to Burnouf, B. C. 543); *Pythagoras*, 580–500; *Socrates*, 470–400, or 399.

Buddha; Persia, after Zoroaster, and Greece, after Pythagoras and Socrates, continued on, in the same paths and with the same tendencies, as before they lived. Nay, all these nations, mutually so diverse, show a steady deterioration united with their apparent changelessness. Where are they to-day, after more than two thousand years since these glorious characters figured in their history? What important progress, what salutary reforms have been achieved? How do they appear when brought into contact and comparison with Christian nations? Outside of Christendom, there have been great displays of activity and power, brilliant exhibitions of genius and virtue, noble attempts at reform, wise philosophic systems, and beautiful mythologic poems, but no true, profound, and fruitful regeneration of man and society.

A few centuries after these barren efforts in the greatest nations of the world, Jesus Christ appears among a people small, obscure, feeble, and despised. He is weak and despised himself in the midst of his people. He neither possesses nor seeks any social power, any worldly means of action or success. He surrounds himself only with disciples weak and despised like himself. Not only are they weak and despised, they declare the fact themselves; and, instead of being disquieted thereby, boast of it, and thence derive confidence. Paul writes to the Corinthians: "And I, brethren, when I came among you, came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom, declaring unto you the testimony of God. For I determined to know nothing among you save Jesus Christ and him crucified. And I was with you in weakness and in fear and in much trembling. Therefore, I take pleasure in infirmities, in reproaches, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses for Christ's sake: for when I am weak, then am I strong." Jesus Christ, the Master of Paul, is strong in his low estate, and communicates his power to his disciples. From the elevation of the cross, he accomplishes what so lately, in Europe and Asia, princes and philosophers, the mighty and the wise, attempted in vain. He brings new light and new power into the souls of men. He brings before all classes and conditions of humanity prospects of good, attainable destinies, up to that time unknown. He liberates men and rules them at once. He inspires and also calms them. He harmonizes human liberty and the law of God. He brings an efficient remedy to the evils which burden humanity. He opens to sin the way of salvation, and to misery the portals of hope.

Whence comes this power of Jesus Christ? What are its source and nature? What did the men who were its witnesses and instruments think and say of it at the time?

They all, with one accord, looked upon Jesus Christ as God. The most did so from the first moment, touched and enlightened, at once, by his presence and his word; others with some more of surprise and hesitation, but soon penetrated and convinced in their turn. (Matt. xvi: 13–17.) "When Jesus came into the coasts of Cesarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, saying, Whom do men say that I the Son of man am? And they said, Some say that thou art John the Baptist; some, Elias; and others, Jeremias, or one of the prophets. He saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my father which is in heaven." At another time, meeting a like uncertainty (John xiv: 7–9), he says: "If ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also: and from henceforth ye know him, and have seen him. Philip saith unto him, Lord, show us the Father, and it sufficeth us. Jesus saith unto him, Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? he that hath seen me hath seen the Father."

There have been observed, and there are, in fact, differences in the language of different Apostles, and in the aspects in which they commonly view their Master. They call him now "the Son of God," and now "the Son of Man." They present him now in a divine, and now in a human aspect. They do not all present exactly the same image of him. They do not all insist equally on the same traits of his nature, nor on the same facts of his earthly life. Matthew is chiefly a narrator and moralist. He recounts with most detail the birth and childhood of Jesus Christ, and gives most fully the Sermon on the Mount. John is more given to contemplating and delineating the divine nature of Christ and his relation to God. (John i: 1, 14, 18.) "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth. No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father,

he hath declared him." It is, also, St. John who reports the testimony of the forerunner, John the Baptist, given in answer to those who came telling him that all men were going for baptism to Jesus Christ. (John iii: 28, 31, 34, 35.) "Ye yourselves bear me witness, that I said, I am not the Christ, but that I am sent before him. He that cometh from above is above all. He whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God: for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him. The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand." Paul is more systematic and more occupied with questions and principles of Christian doctrine, and the Divinity of Jesus Christ is to him a first principle. (Phil. ii: 5–8.) "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus: who being in the form of God did not regard it as an usurpation to be equal with God: but he humbled himself in taking the form of a servant, and becoming like unto men; and having appeared as simply a man, he abased himself, having become obedient unto death, even unto the death of the cross."*

---

*In quoting this passage, I have followed the translation of Osterwald, which is also that of the Vulgate; but my son, William, who still devotes himself to the critical study of Latin and Greek philology, sacred and profane, informs me that there is a difficulty in the text which was felt by Erasmus, Camero, Grotius, Meric Casaubon, and by others, also, before and after their time. The Greek word ἁρπαγμός has two significations, the one active, the other passive, it may designate *the act of robbing, of carrying away by force*, or, *the thing robbed, carried away*,—the act of robbery, or booty. Substantives derived from verbs oscillate not unfrequently between these two kinds of meaning, and such unquestionably is the case with the word ἁρπαγή, which is only another form of ἁρπαγμός. Æschylus, Euripides, and Herodotus have employed it in the first of these significations; Æschylus, Euripides, Thucydides, and Polybius in the second. According as we adopt the one or the other of these meanings, in the passage before us, we must either translate the words, "He did not regard it as an usurpation to be equal with God," or, "He did not make it a trophy to be equal with God;" that is, he did not make a show of his equality with God as human conquerors display the spoils and booty they have amassed; he did not make his divinity the means of contributing to personal exaltation, triumph, or pride; he was not the Messiah whom the carnal Jews had promised themselves, a visible and victorious king; "but, on the contrary, he humbled himself in taking the form of a servant," etc. This second interpretation would appear the more probable. The reasoning in which the passage occurs becomes thus better connected and more natural, while, at the same time, this rendering leaves intact the doctrine of the Apostle. It makes no change either in his conception or his conclusions. Paul affirms none the less strongly in this passage, as well as in all the others, the divinity of the Savior whom he announces to men; and it is from this majesty voluntarily humbled, vailed under the form of a

(Col. i: 15–17.) "Who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature: For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: And he is before all things, and by him all things consist." Peter and John speak in their Epistles like Paul. (2 Pet. i: 16–17.) "For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye-witnesses of his majesty. For he received from God the Father honor and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." (1 John ii: 23.) "Whosoever denieth the Son the same hath not the Father: but he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also." (1 John iv: 2, 3.) "Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is of God: And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God."

Such is the language of the Apostles; such their differences and harmony at the same time. Evidently, they have all the same conception of Jesus Christ, and entertain the same faith in him. To Matthew and John, to Peter and Paul, alike, Jesus Christ is at once God and man—the representative of God on earth, and the link, the mediator, between God and man, come from God and going back to God as the source and center of his being. The doctrine of the incarnation—that is, of the Divinity of Jesus Christ—is found every-where in the sacred books, in the several Gospels, in the Acts and Epistles of the Apostles, and in the writings of the primitive fathers. It is the common and unchanging basis, the source and essence of the Christian faith. It is also affirmed and declared by Jesus Christ himself. That which his disciples believe and say concerning him, is that which he said of himself, and that which they themselves saw and thought concerning him. (Matt. xi: 27.) "All things are delivered unto

---

slave, obedient even to the death of the cross, that he draws for believers an august example and an impressive lesson of humility and mutual helpfulness. Hence, this interpretation has been admitted and defended by two eminent men, one a scholar in the sixteenth century, and the other a theologian in the nineteenth, both of whom were strongly attached to the doctrine of the divinity of Jesus Christ—Meric Casaubon (*De Verborum Usu*, pp. 138–146), and Vinet (*Homiletics*).

me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him." (John x: 30.) "I and my Father are one." And when he is approaching the end of his mission, when after having announced to his disciples that the hour was coming when they should be scattered, every man to his own, and should leave him alone, Jesus Christ raises his heart to God. (John xvii: 1–11.) "Father," said he, "the hour is come; glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee: As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him. And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent. I have glorified thee on the earth: I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do. And now, O Father, glorify thou me, with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was. I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world: thine they were, and thou gavest them me, and they have kept thy word. Now they have known that all things whatsoever thou hast given me are of thee. For I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me; and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me. I pray for them: I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me; for they are thine. And all mine are thine, and thine are mine; and I am glorified in them. And now I am no more in the world, but these are in the world, and I come to thee. Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are."

I could multiply texts; but these, certainly, will suffice to show that there is entire harmony between the words of Jesus Christ, in regard to his own character and rank, and those of his disciples. He describes himself just as they describe him. In regard to all the peculiarities of nature, character, office, there is entire agreement. He calls God "his Father," as his disciples call him "the Son of God." He has the same faith in himself, his nature, and his mission as Matthew, John, Peter, and Paul.

It is a great source of error, in the study of facts, not to know how to stop at their general and essential traits, and to ignore these in order to make prominent those that are partial and

secondary. In regard to that fundamental principle of the Christian religion, the Divinity of Jesus Christ, one may call in question the precise sense and import of some particular word; one may set aside, as a suspected interpolation, this or that clause in some Gospel or Epistle. There will always remain far more than enough to prove that those who, in this day, believe in the Divinity of Jesus Christ, believe only what the Apostles believed and said, and that the Apostles, nearly nineteen hundred years ago, believed and said only what was communicated to them by Jesus Christ himself.

The opponents of the doctrines of the incarnation and the Divinity of Jesus Christ are equally mistaken in respect to man and history, the complex elements of human nature, and the import of the great facts which mark the religious life of the human race.

For, what is man himself but an incarnation, incomplete and imperfect, of God? Materialists, who deny the existence of the soul, and naturalists, who deny creation, are consistent only when they also reject Christianity. If you believe in the difference between matter and spirit; if you do not believe that man is the result of the fermentation of matter, or of the transformation of species, you can not but admit the presence of a divine element in man. You are compelled to accept the word of Moses, "God created man in his own image;" that is, you admit the presence of God in feeble and fallible humanity.

I open the histories of all religions, of all mythologies, the most refined as well as the most gross. I find, at every step, the idea and assertion of an incarnation of God in man. Brahmanism, Buddhism, Paganism, all beliefs and all idolatries, abound in incarnation of every sort and date, primitive or successive, associated with some special historical event, used for the explanation of some particular fact, or for the gratification of some passion of man. It is the natural and universal instinct of men to represent to itself the action of God on the human race under the form of an incarnation.

Like all other religious instincts, the belief in the incarnation of God can give birth, and has given birth, to the most foolish superstitions and the most extravagant hypotheses. Just as the natural faith in God has been the source of all idolatries, so the disposition to believe in the incarnation of God has produced and

admitted every sort of strange imaginations and fictitious traditions. But does this fact prove that every divine incarnation, and every account of divine incarnation, is false? It is a weakness of the human mind that reality and chimera, truth and error, border closely on each other, take each other's names, and are continually confounded. The pretended incarnation of Brahma, or of Buddha, no more disproves the Divinity of Jesus Christ than the worship of idols disproves the existence of God. Jesus Christ, God and man, has attributes which pertain to him alone. They are attributes which have given power and success to his work—a power and success which belong only to himself. It is no human reformer, it is God himself who has wrought by Jesus Christ what no human reformer has ever done or ever conceived—the reformation of the moral and social state of the world, the regeneration of the human soul, and the solution of the problem of human destiny. It is by these works, by these results, that the Divinity of Jesus Christ manifests itself. *How* did the incarnation take place? In this there is a mystery, just as in the union of soul and body and in the creation. But if the *how* eludes our grasp, the *fact* is not, therefore, less sure. When the fact took the form of religious doctrine, theology sought to explain it. In this I think it did wrong. It has obscured the fact by endeavoring to explain and develop it. It is the very fact of the incarnation which constitutes the Christian faith, and which rises above all theological definitions and controversies. To disown the fact, and to deny the Divinity of Christ, is to deny, that is, to subvert, Christianity, which would never have been what it is, and would never have done what it has, if it had not had the incarnation of God for its foundation, and Jesus Christ, God and man, for its author.

V. Redemption.

I enter into the sanctuary of the Christian faith. God has done more than to manifest himself in Jesus Christ. He has done more than to place on the earth, and before men, his own living image, the type of holiness and the model for our life. The Creator has wrought, by Jesus Christ, toward man, his creature, an act of goodness, and, at the same time, of sovereign power. Jesus Christ is God made man, not simply to diffuse divine light among men, but to vanquish and efface in man moral evil, the fruit of the sin of man. He brings to man, not only light and law, but

pardon and salvation. And it is at the price of his own sufferings, of his own sacrifice, that he brings them. He is the type, at once, of self-devotion and of holiness. He submitted to be a victim, in order to be a Savior. The incarnation was the preparation for the cross and the cross, for redemption.

This is the highest doctrine and the highest mystery. Here the significance and breadth of the Christian fact are fully displayed. By what ways has Jesus Christ, in order to accomplish the great fact, penetrated into the human soul? How has he won it for the Christian faith, in order to deliver it from evil and to save it?

Whenever a man fails to comply with the law which he recognizes; whenever he commits a wrong act which he is bound to shun; whenever repentance for sin is awakened within him, another sentiment, the necessity of expiation, is added to that of repentance. It is a moral instinct in man that repentance is not sufficient to blot out crime, and that it ought to be expiated. To make reparation, he must suffer. And when the religious sentiment is joined to the moral sentiment; when man believes in God, and sees in him the author and upholder of the moral law, he regards himself as guilty of wrong toward God, whom he has disobeyed, and feels the need of pardon and of restoration to the favor of the sovereign master he has offended.

Among all nations, in all religions, under all social forms, these two instincts—the necessity of expiation upon the commission of sin, and the necessity of pardon after wrong-doing—manifest themselves as natural and inherent in the human soul. They have been, in all ages and countries, the source of a multitude of beliefs and practices, some pure and touching, others senseless and odious, which may be summed up under the head of *sacrifices*. Barbarous or civilized, ancient or modern, all histories abound in sacrifices of every kind, gross or mystical, pleasing or cruel, devised and offered, sometimes to expiate the sins of men, sometimes to appease the anger of God and to regain his favor.

Another moral fact, no less real, although, to superficial reason, more singular, must be added to this. Men have believed that crime could be expiated by others besides the offender, and that innocent victims could be offered to appease the Deity and save the guilty. From this have come sacrifices as absurd as they were atrocious, and the pretended expiation has often been but one

crime the more. But from this, also, have sprung heroic deeds and sublime self-devotion. The private history of families, and the public history of nations, contain admirable examples of innocence offering itself up in sacrifice, accepting penitence, suffering, and death to expiate the guilt of others, and to obtain from Divine justice, satisfied, the pardon of the offender.

Was it only a pious and generous illusion—a self-devotion as vain as it was beautiful? Yes, this, and nothing more, to those who believe neither in Providence, nor in prayer, nor in any efficacious relation between the actions of men and the purpose of God, nor in the reciprocal obligations and interests of men, nor in any bond between the sacrifice of him who devotes himself and the destiny of him for whom the self-devotion is offered. But those who have faith in the living God, in his continued presence, and his active providence; who believe that nothing on the part of man, whether good or evil, is without effect; and that every moral act produces its own fruit, visible or concealed, proximate or remote, can not but foresee, in the voluntary sacrifice of the innocent for the salvation of the guilty, a mysterious efficacy, the secret of which it is not given to them to penetrate, but which excites in their souls the hope that this divine self-devotion will not fail of its end.

From these sentiments and these acts of man, the reality of which no one will dispute, I pass to the Christian doctrine. Beside the self-devotion and the sacrifices of an innocent human being, seeking to expiate the sin of the guilty human being, I place the self-devotion and the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, God-man, to deliver from sin the human race, and to open to it the way of salvation. Who is not struck with the sublime analogy? What a link, what a harmony, between the most pure, the most generous instincts of the human soul and the doctrine of divine redemption! I touch upon none of the questions, I enter into none of the controversies, which have been agitated in respect to this doctrine. I make no comparison between faith and works; I take no part in the question between divine grace and human virtue; I do not define or take into account the elect. I look at the single fact of redemption by Jesus Christ—the fact on which the doctrine rests. That which the most glorious heroes and saints of humanity have now and then attempted, in order to expiate the sins of this or that creature, of this or that people,

Jesus Christ, the chosen of God, the Son of God, the God-man, came to accomplish for all men, at the cost of incomparable griefs, humiliation, and suffering. As Paul declared, in the first century, and Bossuet, in the seventeenth, it is the sufferings, humiliation, and martyrdom of Jesus Christ which, in connection with his divinity, and in contrast with it, have produced his victory and his empire. What other spectacle than that of God made man in order to be a victim, and a victim in order to be a Savior, could kindle in the soul those sustained transports of admiration, reverence, and love; that ardent, invincible, and contagious faith, the monuments and examples of which the apostles and early Christians have left to us? The victim and the sacrifice were to be equal to the work. The work was the Christian religion—that incomparable system of facts, doctrines, precepts, and promises, which, amid all the doubts and all the controversies of the human mind, has responded, for nineteen centuries, to the instincts and problems of natural religion which relate to the human race. GUIZOT.

THE SUBJECT OF THE TWENTY-SECOND PSALM.*

THIS is a typical Psalm. God is ever to be blessed for revealing to us, through the prophets, his plan of saving mercy; but not less worthy of our admiration and praise is he for so controlling the course of history as to render the lives and deeds of free agents prefigurative of the salvation to be provided in his benevolence and love. The evidence in favor of the divinity and truth of Christianity, derived from this preëstablished harmony of history prefigured and history fulfilled, is equally grand with that derived from its present relation to prophecy. That David, after having been anointed by Samuel, and before he reached the throne, had to pass through suffering resembling the suffering of Jesus, the Son of David, baptized by John, and that this typical suffering of David is presented to us in this Psalm, as in a mirror, is a provision of divine power, and grace, and wisdom.

---

* Translated from *Commentar über den Psalter* von FRANZ DELITZSCH. 2 Vols. Leipsic, 1859.

But this Psalm is not simply typical; for in the type itself is a clear indication of the *difference* between him and the antitype. In describing the sufferings he had experienced, David goes far beyond the literal facts; his lamentations penetrate to a depth deeper than his own sufferings; his hopes rise to a hight far transcending any reward he can personally expect. In consequence of this hyperbolical character, the Psalm becomes typico-prophetical. David, as a sufferer, views himself, the Messiah of God, in Christ; he regards his suffering "in spirit," and thus the background of his history becomes far deeper and higher than his personal history, whether present or future, could make it. How far this spiritual and, so to speak, dioramic view of himself was to David a matter of distinct reflection, within or rather beyond the state of poetical and prophetic elevation, we do not know, but may easily conceive.

In virtue of the Spirit which David possessed after having been anointed, he sees himself in Christ, for this Spirit is the Spirit of the Christ who is to suffer; it is the Spirit to whom the beginning and end of the kingdom of promise are eternally present—the Spirit who searcheth the deep things of God, and, consequently the depths of his benevolent purposes; who mingles groans from these depths with the prayers of all believers, and interweaves in the Psalms of David those features of the present which are the germ of the future. Through this Spirit, the typical history of David, as recorded by himself in the Psalms, and especially in this Psalm, obtains that ideal depth, transformation, and fullness, which carry it far beyond its typical correspondence; it penetrates to the divine decree which constitutes the center of the whole, and rises into a prophetic utterance. So that, in a sense, it may truly be said that Christ here speaks through David, inasmuch as the Spirit of Christ speaks through him, and the typical sufferings of one like him becomes a means of exhibiting his own which are yet to come. Unless we fully recognize the typico-prophetical character of the Psalm, it can not be understood, and much less be felt.

PRESENT TENDENCY OF RELIGIOUS THOUGHT IN GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.*

BY REV. JAMES M'COSH, D. D.

In the end thought rules the world. At times, other and inferior agents appear more prominent on the visible scene; but behind, if you search, you may discover intelligence to set the instruments agoing, and directing and controlling their action. There are times when impulses and passions are more powerful in our world, but they soon expend themselves; while mind, acting constantly, is ready to drive them back, and to work when their energy is exhausted. It comes, then, to be an all-important question, What is the tendency of thought in religious matters throughout the three kingdoms in these times? As the tendency of religious thought in this age, so will be the results in the next. In my study of the history of mankind, I have found the opinions of young men between eighteen and twenty years of age to become, after being somewhat modified and sobered, the opinions of the country generally in the next generation. Hence the subject of my paper—hence the importance of it.

It is evident, at a glance, that we live in an age of inquiry, in an age of restlessness, in an age of discontent with the past, in an age of transition to something worse or something better. The day of the mediæval reaction is obviously past among all our young men in the Protestant Church. The cry is now for an onward march somewhither. The most quiescent and retiring must have heard it. It burst forth in a wild but somewhat uncertain sound in the "Essays and Reviews;" it took a more distinct denunciation in the attack on the Pentateuch. Its utterances are bolder since the decision of the Privy Council in regard to the two Essayists. You find the movement encouraged or opposed in nearly every one of our influential organs of periodical literature. We can not, if we would, shut our ears to the sound, which has become loud enough to wake the most sleepy, to disturb the most contented. It may be wise, instead of trying to shut our

---

* Read at the meeting of the Evangelical Alliance, in Edinburgh, July, 1864.

ears, to inquire seriously what all this noise is about. We who have passed the watershed of life, who have crossed the greatest hights and have begun to descend, are apt to complain that the young are showing too strong a disposition to cast off the old, the venerable, and the settled. Albeit myself reached a full middle age, in which my sun must not mount, but decline, I do not join in that cry. The old is to be respected, because it is old; but the old must not be allowed to crush the new because it is new. I rejoice in the spirit of inquiry that is abroad; I have hopes of an age of inquiry. Any thing is better than stupid indifference, than careless acquiescence in what exists, than a reigning secularity which accepts all that is established, because it does not wish to be troubled with thought or exertion of any kind. The age when Christianity was diffused, the age of the Reformation, were ages of inquiry. Give me life, at all hazards, rather than death, which has no perils because it has nothing to lose. I hail the young life of our day in religion. I can give, I can discover, no reason why the young should not inquire in this age, as their forefathers did in the ages which we are accustomed to regard as the purest and noblest. But an age of inquiry, while it is one which inspires hope, is also one which raises anxiety. The vessel will not move till the anchors are lifted; but it is when the ship is ready to move that we must see to it that the compass be in order, that the sails be right set, that the pilot be at the helm, lest the voyage end in a shipwreck. We fathers can not keep our young men from thinking for themselves, and setting out on their own course in life, as we have done ourselves in our day; but even when we hope for good, we may have apprehensions for them in these excited times, when the most sacred topics are discussed, old creeds searched, and old opinions weighed.

This age will not allow itself to be called an infidel one; nor does it deserve the name. For the Christian Church is strong in faith, in hope, in zeal, in activity. I doubt much whether it ever was in a healthier state in respect of its numerous and devoted membership, its missionary effort at home and abroad, its able defenders, and its literary organs. But it can not be denied that in front of it there is a formidable enemy, powerful in its intellectual ability, its literary accomplishments, its scientific, and, particularly, its geological attainments, and, above all, in its earnestness and understood compactness of combination. That power is not pre-

pared to avow itself an enemy to religion. Last century, it was the habit of skeptics to scoff at all serious faith, and to represent professed religious convictions as being either fanatical or hypocritical, and as, in fact, offering the greatest hindrances to the advancement of the race. It is now freely admitted that man is, in his very nature, a religious being; that he has spiritual instincts and propensities which must have an outlet, and which require to be gratified by some form of worship, enlightened or degraded. It is conceded that every community of mankind must have a religious faith and fellowship, and that all attempts to interfere with this must recoil on those who make them. But, alongside with this admission, there is an attack, vigorous and sustained, on the creed of the past—in some cases on Christianity, as having served its purpose and now become antiquated, but more frequently upon the old forms of Christianity, more especially as embodied in the formulas and confessions of every Church. Those who have been looking into our popular literature, particularly the periodical literature, are quite familiar with this. You may find it not only in an offensive form in the *Westminster*, but in a more reverential spirit in the *National* and *Fraser*, and, on occasions more or less rare, in the *Edinburgh* and *Saturday*. In the country in which we are met, the party seeking to sap the national creed has long had an able and persevering exponent in the *Scotsman* newspaper. I suppose it would be reckoned a recommendation to a lecturer for the Philosophical Institution in this city that he was supposed to be dissatisfied with the old theology. Whether this arises from the predilections of certain of the directors or the known wishes of the audience, I am not in a position to say; but, in either case, it is a sign of the times. Along with this, there is in the progressing Church itself a considerable discontent with the old theological phrases and modes of thought. Our independent youths proclaim that our forefathers had no right to impose their creed on their descendants. Our advanced spirits boast that, having reached manhood, they have outgrown the boyhood of the race. The hearts of the more timid, anxious, and doubting have been wrung, till feelings more bitter than tears have been wrung from them as they surveyed the contest. As the result, we have a general discontent with the old, a cry for reform, and an expectation and prediction that something new and better must appear. But this is not the only nor the peculiar

characteristic of the age. In this respect, it is like what other ages have been.

The peculiarity of this age is, that it can not or will not declare what it wants, wishes, and expects. It would compare itself to the seventeenth century, or to the Reformation epoch, or even at times, in its presumption, to the very time when Christianity arose. But there is, at least, this important difference: The Puritans, the Reformers, and the Apostles did not content themselves with expressing dissatisfaction with abuses, they had something positive to offer, and announced it clearly, explicitly, and boldly. But in the present age, there is a studied or a weak and vascillating uncertainty about the expected improvement. On the one hand, the infidel keeps his purpose wrapt up in a cloud, in which it bulks very largely and very shapelessly. He concedes that man is a religious animal, that a religion must be provided for him, and he promises that it shall and will come, and will be very pure, very rational, and very beneficent. But he never condescends to tell you where it is to come from, and he declines, for the present, to explain what it is to be; and if you insist on something more specific, he breaks forth into expressions about a belief in the good and the infinite, but never becomes more articulate in his utterances. There is a like indefiniteness and haziness about the reform and improvement sought by Christians of the progressive school. Some of them tell you that divine truth is too grand, wide, and comprehensive to submit to human definition or expression. They would scarcely go so far, indeed, as the ancient Alexandrian mystics, who opposed a refined paganism to the rapidly advancing Christianity, and declared that nothing could be predicated of God, and that it was profane to make any affirmation regarding Him. Some of those whose names are often quoted in connection with the expected improvement of Christianity very nearly approach this. I have heard the late Chevalier von Bunsen (a man whom no one could meet, as I have done in familiar intercourse, without at once recognizing in him a genuine Christian) declare that he could not allow God to be called a "person," and had doubts about the propriety of designating Him a "being." Many, who would draw back from such an extreme, decline to give any account of the nature of this new faith of which they cherish the expectation that it is to dispel all uncharitableness, and introduce a new era of peace and

love. This age has a special aversion to a settled creed. It is, to some extent, a reaction against the attempt of the theologians of the seventeenth century to fix every divine truth in logical formulæ. The pendulum is now swinging to the other side. If before we had the hight so cold and rugged, we have now the hollow, with its damps and curling mists. The flow may have been too great, but the ebb is quite as excessive, with its exposed sludge, in which we run some risk of sinking, and its floating malaria, which may gender fever. A clear idea, a settled conviction, is now represented as a thing impossible, and not desirable if it were possible. Doubt is exalted to the rank of a virtue. Cloudiness is thought to be preferable to clearness. Using but abusing the language of Scripture, they tell us that we must all be baptized in the cloud and the sea. This must, necessarily, be a transition state of things. People will not remain long in their present position of vagueness and vacillation. Suspense is at all times painful, and persons hasten out of it as soon as possible, preferring even the worst certainty to uncertainty. It is this circumstance which renders these times so momentous. We are come to a point from which two roads diverge; our eager youths will not long remain there, and they will betake themselves to the right or to the left. I fear, as to some, that they may take the path which leads toward infidelity, without knowing it. I have confidence, however, as to most of these, that when they do know whither they are journeying, they will draw back before they are left in a desert of unbelief. Meanwhile, they will be allured forward on the pretext that, at the next turning of the road, some grand prospect will be disclosed. The present doubt and uncertainty, they acknowledge, are very uncomfortable, very much like the melting of the snow and the breaking up of the ice, in which there are deep roads and flooded waters, where there is bad walking and difficult standing; but they are told that a spring-time is at hand. The mist in which they are at present enveloped is, they acknowledge, thick, heavy, and unwholesome; but there it is, the mist of the morning, which is soon to clear away, and disclose a bright and bracing day. They are confidently assured that something new and better is to appear. Let them ask their leaders to tell them precisely what it is to be. The answer, if they condescend to give one, must be that it is a new country which is to be disclosed, and that it is wrong in us to demand a

premature map of it. All the remark that I have to make on this, in passing, is, that it is quite clear that these leaders of thought have nothing, absolutely nothing, positive to present to us. They would have our young men commit themselves to a current which is drifting on they will not tell us whither, only holding out some hope of a sunny land, to which we may apply the language of our great living poet, the Poet-Laureate of the new school—

> "I babbled for you, as babies for the moon,
> Vague brightness!"

But if they will not answer the first question, there is a second which you should put, and to which you are entitled to have an answer from these would-be leaders of religious thought. If they will not or can not tell you what this new thing is to be, let them, at least, specify the quarter from which we are to expect it. Do they suppose that some great man, or set of men, in Germany, in France, in London, or at Oxford will be able to fashion it? I rather think that this is too preposterous a proposal to be seriously made by them. When Napoleon Bonaparte was purposing to restore the Roman Catholic religion, which had been swept away at the Revolution, the infidels of France proposed to him that he should frame a new religion instead. But the shrewd observer of mankind laughed at the idea. As to the German professors, they might be more profitably employed in settling the constitution of their country than in devising a new religion; and in this work they will find that they have to begin by removing that wide-spread infidelity which they have produced among the people, and which is, in fact, the greatest obstacle to the advance of the cause of order and progressive liberty in that country. As to the French *savans*, they might be better engaged in preparing their country for making a good use of liberty, the great obstacle in the way of which is just the want of a belief in a pure Christianity. As to the London *literati*, they are able to write brilliant articles, but they would be amazed if any one were to ask them to concoct a new faith.

The Oxford Essayists, however powerful in destruction, have, as yet, shown no aptness for construction. If pushed for an answer to the question, Whence are we to expect the new religion? the answer must be, From further research and inquiry—in short, from human intelligence. Yes, it is to this they must come, that

they look for it from human reason. Now, it would not do for me to seek to disparage the faculties of man. In my published writings, I have labored to show what truth in religion can be established by proper research. It is the business of my life, as Professor of Logic and Philosophy, to unfold the nature and the laws of human intelligence. But what can human reason do in regard to religion? Has not the history of human reason, in this respect, been a history of wanderings? Some evidently dream, and hint in broken expressions as they do so, that we might set aside the Bible and yet have a religion. The illustrious Bacon has sketched what the religion of nature can do. "As concerning Divine philosophy or natural theology, it is that knowledge or rudiment of knowledge concerning God which may be obtained by the contemplation of His creatures, which knowledge may be truly termed Divine in respect of the object, and natural in respect of the light. The bounds of this knowledge are, that it sufficeth to convince atheism, but not to inform religion."

But it is urged that we might still have a God, a morality, and the immortality of a soul. The majority of those who have abandoned Christianity, and who have not gone on to atheism, are pantheists. And what is pantheism? I am not asking what the adherents of it believe it to be. I am inquiring what it is. It means that God and the creature are one; that man is some mode of God; that man when he sins is God; that man when he tells a lie, that man when he commits adultery, that man when he murders a neighbor, is a part of God. This is the creed avowed by the great body of the Germans who have turned away from the Bible. M. Renan is exceedingly indignant at those who affirm that he has no religion; he wishes, he says, to be religious, and regrets that he is so much cut off from communion with religious people. I give him all credit for longing, in the depths of his heart, for a religion and for a communion with fellow-worshipers; and I am sure he often feels a want, and he seems to me to give vent to it, at times, in plaintive tones, as if he felt that, like Esau, he had lost his birthright. But what has he left to satisfy him? He professes to believe in God. But what sort of God has he left? He does not avow pantheism, but his God is evidently the God of a vague sentimental pantheism. He is ever breaking forth into raptures about an absolute morality, an eternal morality; but what this is he does not condescend to tell us. I fear that the

morality which remains after you have taken away a personal God to guard it, and to call men to account at a judgment-day, will not be an eternal morality, but of a very changing and transitory character. And as to the immortality of the soul, what is the doctrine left? The Frenchman, evidently, thinks that man can not be held to be composed of two substances, and that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is inconsistent with physiology. The following passage contains all that he is allowed to hope: "Those who do not stoop to conceive of man as composed of two substances, and who find the theistical dogma of the immortality of the soul in contradiction with physiology, love to rest in the hope of a final reparation, which, under an unknown form, will satisfy the want of the human heart." And what is this (mark his word): "Who knows but that the last term of progression, in millions of ages, may bring forth the absolute consciousness of the universe, and in that consciousness the awakening of all that has lived?" It is put in the form of a question, Who knows? and no decisive answer is given. But, admitting that he does wish us to answer in the affirmative, will it satisfy the wants of the human heart as we stand by the corpse of a beloved friend, as we ourselves look forward to death and the grave? In his "Life of Jesus," he admits the most of the events of our Lord's life down to His death on the cross, and here he closes the volume. It is a suitable close. This fifth Gospel gives us a death, but gives us no resurrection. In the Christian Church, as at the creation of the world, the evening and the morning constitute the day; in this new religion, which is to supersede the Christian, the night cometh, but there is no morning.

I suppose that I happen to be thrown into the circle of the influential writers of our periodical literature—including young men reared at Oxford and Cambridge, and at Edinburgh—in fact, what I am now to give you is a real conversation in a distinguished literary company, only somewhat disguised to avoid references to individuals. I was, first of all, not a little surprised to find that the conversation could not be turned away from religion. To whatever other topic it led for a time, it always swung back to this. The spirit of these leaders of opinion was, We must have something better than we now have—it is coming, it is rapidly coming. I did not choose to enter into direct argument with the formidable and apparently united phalanx. As I was in so small

a minority, I thought it might be more prudent simply to toss in a barley-cake into the camp, such as the man saw in his dream tumbling into the host of Midian. As I had been reading Plato, shortly before, I tried, at a great distance, to follow the Socratic method. I told them I had a great desire to know what this new faith might be, from which so much was expected by distinguished men, and I declared, honestly, that if they could show it to be a better I would adopt it. I sat waiting for information, only wishing them to allow that man must have a religion, which they all freely allowed. As students of human nature, which some of them were, as conversant with history, which they all were, they acknowledged that man had religious inclinations and wants, and that, in all ages and countries, mankind have had some sort of apprehension, faith, or hope, in regard to a supernatural being or power. Well, I said, gentlemen, we are now ready to start on this exploring expedition after truth. The boldest of the thinkers declared that we must have something better than Christianity, which, he said, had had its day, and done its work, upon the whole a beneficent one, but was now ready to vanish away. Half a dozen voices interposed, and I was silent. Where are you to get this new religion? said one. Are you to go back to paganism? Not just that, was the reply; we must advance and not retrograde. From mesmerism and clairvoyance? asked a second, referring significantly to some who had abandoned Christianity and taken refuge from a black atheism, staring them in the face, in spirit-rapping. A scoff was all the reply given by our shrewd infidel, who was not to be taken in by such pretenses. From a new revelation by God? was the inquiry of a third; to which he answered that he believed in no revelation in time past, and expected none in time to come. From human reason? asked several simultaneously; and it was shown successfully that the history of human reason in religious matters had been, in time past, a history of wanderings, and it was shown that the advocates of human reason, even in this enlightened age, were not agreed on almost any thing. It was shown that some thought that the works of nature could prove that there was a God, while others were doubtful whether Hume's objections and Kant's criticism had been answered. It was shown that of those who believed in a God, a considerable number were pantheists. One remarked that, apart from the resurrection of Christ, the doctrine of the resurrection of the body

had nothing to sustain it; and another declared that he was not convinced, by the arguments of natural theology, of the doctrine of the life of the soul after the death of the body. As to morality, it was allowed that the great body of those who rejected Christianity made virtue consist in mere utility, and, in supporting their utilitarian theory, had great difficulty in showing how man was obliged to do any more than look after his own happiness. The half-dozen asked triumphantly what religion would remain in the world, what faith, what worship, if revelation were discarded.

The infidel, finding himself in a minority, drew off, seated himself beside me, and said he would not allow the supporters of Christianity to settle these disputes. The most advanced of the professing Christians now took the lead. He would have a new Christianity, improved in form and spirit. I said that, as having a belief in the perfection of Christianity, but no faith in the perfection of Christian sects or individuals, this was what I wished, and I asked how he proposed to accomplish his reform. The heart, said he, the heart is the seat of all religion. It matters little what men believe if the heart is right. Let us have the fervor of the best Christians, there can be no religion without feeling. But we may have all this without believing in an inspired book—certainly without submitting to a stiff creed. I revere Jesus Christ, exclaimed he, as the noblest manifestation of God; that is my religion. I said I was glad to hear so much, and wished him to unfold the grounds which led him to believe and admit so much. The advanced Christian was now assailed by as many able opponents as the infidel had been, and the infidel joined them. It was shown, by one of the students of human nature, that feeling could not be kept up without an object to love; that we could not love a person if we did not believe him to exist, and that we ought not, and could not, in fact, believe without some reasons or grounds; and it was shown that we must, after all, come back to the New Testament, particularly the Four Gospels. "Not," added the ablest speaker, at this stage, turning to me as he said so, "not that I believe that the Bible is mechanically inspired or free from error. I follow Dr. Colenso so far, and I am not sure about the Old Testament, at least the Pentateuch." Our speaker had instantly the old opponents and new ones. It was shown that the Old Testament and the New were a piece; that the one was a precursor of the other, and that Jesus sanctioned the Old Testament,

including the Books of Moses, very specially. The speaker, a clergyman, who established this point most clearly, now began to tell us that for himself he cared little for the letter of the Bible; he was all for the spirit. I told him that I agreed with him in the latter point; I was for the spirit, but I begged to ask him how a sinner without the spirit, selfish and ungodly, was to get the spirit except by being instructed by the written Word. Half a dozen came to my aid, and I gave up the work to them. The clergyman was asked if he believed in the deity of Christ, and he replied, boldly, that he held the doctrine to be a cardinal one. He was asked on what grounds, and he was obliged to reply because it was contained in the Bible; and it was shown that if the Bible be sufficient to establish the astounding doctrine that Jesus, the Son of Mary, who was crucified at Jerusalem one thousand eight hundred and thirty years ago, was really a Divine person, we need not stagger at any other doctrine set forth in it. It was further shown how unsatisfactory it was to reject the written Word, and throw us back upon the spirit, as it made every man's spirit, and that possibly a very carnal spirit, the judge of what is to be received and what is to be rejected; and the infidel took a special pleasure in proving that this method threw us back on that reason which, it had been alleged against him, so often wanders, and, at best, sees religious truth so dimly.

As the discussion was now becoming very keen, I thought best to interfere. I ventured to express my disappointment at finding that those who were heralding this new religious era could agree on so little, and had, in fact, nothing to meet and supply the wants of human nature. But I confessed that I too was a reformer; that I too was looking for a brighter epoch and a better Church; that certainly I had no idea of giving up the written Word, but that I did hope that, by means of the letter, Christians would rise beyond the letter to the spirit that is love, which is the spirit of Jesus, which is the spirit of God, for "God is love." It is allowed, in the present day, that every community must have a religion, but it is proposed to have a religion without a creed. Worship, and fervor, and feeling, all these are commended. It is acknowledged that, without emotion and ardor, religion could have no power for good. But, then, it is imagined that we may have all these without a faith in any fixed doctrine. And here I may mention that there was an analogous, though by no means an identical, movement

in the last century. The proposal then was to retain and promote morality without a faith in fixed doctrine. It was acknowledged to be all-important to the individual and the community to keep up virtue, including honesty, neighborly kindness, and temperance, but they supposed that all this might be had without a belief in any deep or mysterious religious tenets. Francis Hutcheson, the celebrated Professor of Moral Philosophy in Glasgow, wrote to a non-subscribing minister in Ireland, in 1742. "I have been laboring," he says, "to get Mr. Lechman appointed Professor of Theology. If he succeed, it will put a new face upon theology in Scotland." This professor, discouraging all doctrinal expositions and all rousing appeals to the conscience, would have preachers recommend the Christian religion as embracing a pure morality, and holding out a hope of a blessed immortality; but, meanwhile, providing no pardon to the poor sinner anxious about the past, nor gracious aid to help him in his struggles to deliver himself from sin in the future. "He will put a new face upon the theology of Scotland."

If it had aimed at giving a *better heart* to the theology of Scotland—a more tolerant, a wider, and more sympathizing heart—the attempt would have been commendable; and, with the new heart, there would have been a new face, as the expression of the inward sentiment. But the attempt to get the new face without the internal conviction gave only an artificial blandness to the countenance, which could not conceal the hollowness within. The preachers reared may be taken as represented by Jupiter Carlyle, whom I need not describe, for he has described himself. The new device to make men moral ended in making them very immoral. The influence was first upon the upper classes; we see it going down to the peasant class in the days of Robert Burns, and, by the end of the century, it infected the whole of Scottish society. It was at this time that the ungodly masses sprang up in our great cities, with none to care for their souls. It was when Evangelical religion revived, that, at the call of Chalmers and other earnest men, women went forth to visit the dwellings of the poor and reclaim the outcast. Now, there is an attempt in our day, not just the same as that of last century, but considerably like it. It is allowed that in religious matters there should be life and feeling, but it is expected that this may be had independent of all the old forms of orthodoxy and of the letter of the Word of God.

But where, I ask, is this life to come from? How is this feeling to be raised? The appeal in our day is to inward feelings, sentiments, and intuitions. But what, I ask, is to evoke these from our hearts, so selfish and so sinful? Perhaps they tell us that affection may be called forth by the grand and glorious ideas of the good, the infinite. M. Renan has somewhere a flourish of this kind, to the effect that you need not be afraid of religion dying or disappearing, though the Gospel history is set aside; for have we not, says he, the infinite, the eternal? Now, I admit that man can entertain such ideas; and I have set myself in opposition to that philosophy of our day which makes them a mere negation—a view capable of being turned, and actually being turned, by Herbert Spencer to a dismal form of infidelity. But these ideas call forth love only when associated with a living being whose love is infinite, whose love is eternal. To raise the affections, there must be an object; there must be a living being to draw them toward himself. And, in order to this, we must know something of that being; we must believe in his reality and in his excellence. I can love a being whom I have not seen, "whom having not seen we love;" but I can not love a person of whom I have no idea, and in whose reality I have no faith. The being who calls forth my love is Jesus Christ, set forth to my faith in the written Word, and it is the belief in him that creates feeling and stirs up zeal and activity. The life which is not sustained by scriptural truth must be of a very wavering and transient character. By all means, let us have the fire and the flame too; but no fire can be kept up without a solid material. That material is Christ, presented in the Word. "I am glad," wrote David Hume to Hutcheson, "to see such just philosophy and such instructive morals to have once set their foot in the schools. I hope they will next get into the world, and then into the Churches." I suppose this is what is aimed at in the present day, to get the new creeds, or rather sentiments, into the universities, into the world, and into the Churches; and many, who are lending themselves to the movement, do not see the issue.

The attempt to keep up feeling, without a settled faith in truth, must end in making the people first unbelieving, then cold, and finally immoral; the flame with nothing to feed on will die down, and only ashes remain. I admit that there may be religion in the individual without a long or complex formalized creed; but,

surely, there can not be a religion without faith. There can not be piety without a belief in God; there can not be Christian piety without a belief in Christ, "for he that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is the rewarder of them that diligently seek Him." I am prepared to maintain that a religious belief has its influence, in some cases, unhappily, not so much as it should, the religion being good; in others more than it should, the religion being bad. The belief of a people must find expression, and gather round it a worship, and sentiments, and social practices, and will force itself, sooner or later, on a creed opposed to prevailing heresies, wanderings, and schism; and the whole must have its influence upon communities and individuals. Is there no difference visible between those lands which have a pagan and those which have a Christian creed? Is there no difference between those communities which have a Protestant and scriptural, and those which have a Papal and priestly faith? I maintain that it is impossible, according to the principles of human nature, to keep up a religion without faith of some kind. In every walk of life, in every path of duty, faith is needed in order to exertion, to hope, to activity. If I do not believe a particular man to be honest and deserving, I will not put myself to trouble to promote his advancement in the world. If some one were to convince me that a brother is dishonorable, that a sister is treacherous, my esteem and affection would henceforth be much diminished. I may be much moved, for the moment, by the sufferings and sorrows of the heroine of a novel, but, as not believing in her danger, I do not set out to relieve her, unless, indeed, I am to become a Don Quixote; and even Don Quixote had to be made to believe in the existence of Dulcinea, before he set forth to fight her battles. If the clever Frenchman could convince me, which he is not likely to do, that our Lord could be guilty of artifice at the grave of Lazarus, my reverence and love for Him would henceforth cease. There may be piety in the bosom, I admit, when there are no very clear ideas in the head. But it is another question whether they are fitted to teach others who have not themselves attained somewhat clear notions and settled convictions. I have known some men of warm Evangelical piety who have had a very scanty and defective creed. There could be no doubt about admitting such to the fellowship of the Church, but, surely there might be a doubt about the propriety of authorizing

them to give instruction to the people. It is not for me to say what should be the measure proposed, by that commission which has been appointed by Her Majesty, to settle practically what should be the nature and the place of tests in the Church of England. I may be allowed, however, to give it as my own opinion, and the opinion of many others, both within and beyond her communion, that a more responsible trust has not been committed to any public body for the last two centuries. I feel that it does not belong to me to say how the creed of the Church of England is to be guarded. But as loving all that is good, and receiving all that is great in that Church, and being convinced that a departure from the faith in that Church would be followed by tremendous consequences throughout universal Christendom, I may be permitted to express my wish and prayer that she will come out of her present trial, retaining for Christ and His Word the high place which they have hitherto had in her Articles. I hope she will be able to do so, notwithstanding the opposing influence of very learned, of very intellectual, and, I believe, very good men. If we transport ourselves back one hundred and fifty years, and look upon the half century preceding, and ask what were the great names of the epoch, every one would point to four great men rising up, like mountains, shoulder-high above all their compeers—to Milton, to Newton, to Locke, and to Samuel Clarke. Now, it is well known that the whole of these great men abandoned a doctrine which Christians have almost universally acknowledged to be a fundamental one in our faith; not one of them believed in the proper divinity of our Lord. It is matter of history that the timid youths of the beginning of last century were afraid that this doctrine would have to be abandoned, and that the more advanced youths were demanding that it should be expunged from the binding creed of the Churches. But the Church of England, even in that age, usually reckoned one of the darkest ages in her history, was too faithful to her Lord to consent to omit this doctrine from her creed, where it still remains; while the creeds of the intellectual giants to whom I have referred have become so entirely antiquated, that it would be difficult now to find any person of weight or name to take up their precise position. The attack is not now, on the part of professing Christians, on the divinity of our Lord. Some of the thinkers of our time have brought themselves to believe (on the grounds which seem to me, I confess, to

be far from satisfactory) that the Trinity is a doctrine of the higher reason, as well as of revelation.

Now, is there not a lesson in all this to those who might be tempted to abandon some other great truths, such as the atonement of Christ, and the inspiration of the Bible? Let not the eyes of our young men be so dazzled by the intellectual greatness of some of those who would give up these truths, as to neglect to look at the consequences. You can not, it is urged, be wrong in following such men, so great and so good. My good friends, do not you see that the proposal is merely to make you give up creeds in order to follow men supposed to be great; to tempt you to abandon the combined wisdom of many, in order to follow the wisdom of some individual thinkers. The late Archdeacon Hare has made a profound remark which bears on this subject: "To form a correct judgment concerning the tendency of any doctrine, we should rather look at the fruit it bears in the disciples than in the teacher. *For he only made it; they are made by it.*" I would not choose to be molded, or that my children should be *made*, by a system which abandoned the inspiration of the Bible, and the doctrine of reconciliation to God by the blood of sprinkling. I should tremble for the country and for the ages which might be *made* by such a system or want of system. However I may love the individuals and respect the eminence which they have reached, I can not forget that many a clever man, just because he has reached a hight, has set a stone rolling, without perceiving or anticipating the destruction it would work in its downward progress. But should there not, it is asked, be a universal toleration of opinion in the nation, and in the Church as a national institution? And then an attractive picture is drawn of the beauty of diversity of sentiment. It is described as a harmony made up of a diversity of sounds; it is likened to the parti-colored garment worn by Joseph, to the forest or lawn with trees of different forms, to the garden with flowers of varied hues, or an army made up of troops with various banners—

> "Each has his gift.
> Our souls are organ-pipes of diverse stop
> And various pitch; each with its proper notes
> Thrilling the self-same breath of God;
> Though poor alone, yet joined they're harmony."

Great evil, they say, must arise to religion if the clergyman is known to be so fettered that he dare not form or express an independent opinion, and can not advance with the knowledge of the times. What a testimony to the truth is given when the minister of religion, while free to hold any opinion, does yet set forth the doctrines of the cross in their purity.

Now, I am not to say a word against a universal toleration in the nation. All history has shown that error is not to be put down by the arm of the civil power, but by far different weapons. "The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but spiritual," and there it is that they are mighty, through God, to the pulling down of strongholds. But, surely, it would be going too far to affirm that there should be a universal toleration of opinion in a Church of Christ. This mingling of all creeds and of none might be looked at, and might look pretty enough in a collegiate body, a consulting committee, or a debating society met to discuss all possible points. But the Church of England, while it is a national institution, is also a Church of Christ, and is adopted, as I understand, into the constitution because it is a Church of Christ, and fulfills its high and holy end because it is a Church of Christ. "We hold," says the illustrious Guizot, in a paper presented, the other day, to the Conference of the Reformed Churches in France, "as firmly as any, both for those who differ from us and for ourselves, the tutelary principles of religious liberty. In virtue of this principle, every one is free to profess openly his belief, and to unite with those who also profess it; but we can not comprehend the idea of a Church without a common faith, or as a body in which the most diverse or even contradictory creeds might be alike professed. Such a state of things would not be the exercise of religious liberty, but the destruction of religious society, which needs, more than any other society, intimate and serious sympathy." When the Irish would not take David Hume as Chief Secretary because he was a Scotchman, a philosophic English princess proposed, as being an easier thing, to make him an Irish bishop. I believe she made the remark as a joke; but he would surely be a bold man who would make such a proposal in earnest.

I am quite willing to admit that there should be diversities in a Church, but there must be a substantial unity, otherwise our Zion would not be the perfection of beauty, which has never, so far as I know, been defined as diversity, but as unity with divers-

ity. I am not just inclined, for the present, to put the lion and the lamb together till the Millennium, when the lion, I suppose, must get somewhat of the nature of the lamb. Let us draw out the entire picture, not as fancy would paint it, but as it would really be. In this parish you have a Socinian, in the next parish you have a preacher of justification by faith, and, in the parish beyond, a Puseyite. What, I ask, are the people of this district to think of the religion which is exhibited before them? The inhabitant of the first parish is told that Jesus was a mere man, and that we do not need a Savior; the inhabitant of the next is assured that Jesus is the Son of God, and the Savior that all men need; while, in the third, the people are exhorted to hear the Church instead of Christ. What, I ask, must be the effect of this? One of two consequences would follow. Either the people, still looking on religious questions as of surpassing interest, would be forever quarreling about doctrine and worship, and the Church would not exhibit that perfect picture of decorum, and peace, and love which are expected to spring from universal toleration; or, what I reckon as a more probable result, first, the shrewder minds of the community, and then the great body of the people, would come to the conclusion that there could be no truth ascertained, or, that truth was not worth seeking after, when their teachers so disagreed, and were so allowed and encouraged to disagree, and would regard all religion with profound indifference.

But, we have not yet looked at the whole evil. There is, we may suppose, a remote country parish, with a scattered population, which has one clergyman, and is so poor that it can not have any other, whether chapel of ease or Dissenting house of worship. That one clergyman is the only one who preaches to them; and he preaches that man needs no Savior, that his parishioners may trust to their supposed good works, which, in such a case, will soon, I believe, be very bad works, and waxing worse and worse. I am entitled—nay, required—to apply the language of the Apostle to such a state of things: "But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other Gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." And what should we say of a Church which, knowingly and deliberately,

authorizes and accredits such a clergyman to be the sole minister of Jesus in the parish to old and young, to young men, and maidens, and little children, perhaps, for a whole generation? Such an institution might receive support from the men of the world; but I believe that good men within that Church would combine with good men beyond it in sweeping it off the face of the earth as an intolerable evil. Verily, I believe that at the judgment day the lost sinner would stand up against it, and those who insisted on supporting it, and affirm that it might be different with me, had I been told, when on earth, of a loving and suffering Savior, who made atonement for transgression.

I am bound to allow that some present evil may arise from the existing ferment and dissatisfaction. I have already said that the attempted resuscitation of mediæval—that is, of an ecclesiastical and priestly faith—has proved altogether a failure in this nineteenth century. It has been like the attempt that is sometimes made by a lady advanced in years to bring back her youth simply by putting on the dress of her former years; the project could only be kept up for a brief period, and has been extinguished by ridicule. The extravagance of the Oxford school of the last age has only helped to bring about the criticism and the doubt of the Oxford school of this age; and I expect nothing from a younger Oxford, which has cheered the Bishop of Oxford, and at one and the same time hissed the Dean of Westminster and Mr. Spurgeon. The mediæval revival has disappeared as a fixed belief, and has left no enduring impression, so far as I can see, except a certain æsthetic or artistic sentiment, favoring Church music and architecture, unless we should add a reaction in favor of rationalism.

It is an instructive circumstance that the age of the higher, or what is called ideal pantheism in philosophy, is also passing away, having left, in like manner, only its one impression, in a vague general sentiment, of all nature being full of life and full of beauty. It is my duty carefully to watch the tendency of thought in philosophy; and it seems to me that, looking to the more powerful and influential minds in Europe, and to the disposition of our advanced youths, we are coming back to the materialistic or sensational doctrine of the last century, made somewhat more attractive by a pantheistic spirit pervading it. One class of speculators assure us that man is descended from the brutes by natural

generation; another class derive thought from physical, from nervous, and from brain force; and there are eminent men trying to account for all the phenomena of the world by matter and force. These are symptoms of a downward inclination, and give us a glimpse of the depths into which some are prepared to descend. And the question comes to be anxiously put by many, Are these views to go down to the mass of the people? We know what has taken place in Germany. The professors in the universities were the first to lose their faith, and, in the next age, the people became unbelieving. The praise be to the grace of God; the theological (I fear not the other) professors are now comparatively sound and Evangelical; but, so far as I have been able to observe, the great body of the nation has not come back to a Bible faith. It is a historical proof, that it is much easier in our world to do evil than to do good, and that men do evil which they can not undo. If the infidelity goes down in this country to the common people, it will assume in our practical country a more practical and, I fear, a more vulgar and debasing form. It is vain to expect that the people of England and Scotland, after their fixed creed has gone, will retain that head enthusiasm and ideal fervor which a German cherishes. But I entertain a deep and decided hope that the evil will not reach such a stage in our land; for if the enemy be strong, the Church of Christ is also strong, thanks to its Great Head—strong in its ability and scholarship—strong in its piety. Meanwhile, our professors of theology and of philosophy have a very important duty to discharge, in sending forth from our colleges a body of young men thoroughly furnished with principles and with learning, to meet and throw back the advancing evil. Not, indeed, that I would expect, or even wish, that all, or the great body of our young preachers, should be encouraged to go forth and do battle with the infidel. On the contrary, I am convinced that it would be an unmitigated evil to find our ordinary preachers appearing before our promiscuous congregations, not to preach Jesus Christ to perishing sinners, and recommend holiness of life, but to meet objections which the audience, perhaps, never heard of till a feeble attempt was made to reply to them.

What I venture to suggest is, that by special classes, theological or philosophical, in our colleges, or by special courses of study pursued under the superintendence of the professors, or by

societies, formed among the students themselves, for reading and mutual stimulus—and it may be by study for a time in Germany—a select few, with talents fitted for the work, may be trained for the special work of throwing back the infidelity of the day, and creating a new and a higher feeling in our great cities and throughout the land. It would be far wrong, I think, in the Evangelical Alliance, to take up the position of an alarmist, and to prophesy only evil. I am cherishing the confident expectation that much good will come out of these agitations and discussions. Following out the principles allowed them by mistaken Christians, infidels have brought us to the edge of the precipice, and compelled us to look into the dark abyss below. I do fear that some vain and reckless youths may be tempted to leap over, and will find, in the downward plunge, that below the visible deep there is a lower still. But sober thinkers will draw back. Persons who were not alarmed by the "Essays and Reviews," who were not frightened by Dr. Colenso, have been keenly offended by the attack on the reality and the purity of our Lord's life, by M. Renan. It is an instructive fact, that when Strauss's work was published in Germany, nearly thirty years ago, the tide began to turn, and that country has, since that time, produced the most learned defenses of the faith ever written. I have observed, with much interest, in our own land, that some, who were on the road to infidelity without being aware of it, have seen that it is time to stop, and are beginning to retrace their steps.

In these times of searching, we may have to give up some few things which our fathers believed in, which we ourselves revered in our youth. But, is it for the good of religion that we should stand up for all that has been alleged to be Christianity—for all that is traditional? If there be an inquirer who, in an honest, independent judgment, is inclined to say, "I do not like that old scholastic distinction, that old theological phrase brought in by the fathers, or in the early Church, or by the schoolmen of the middle ages, or by the Reformers, or by the Puritans," I say to him, You are quite entitled to examine it, quite at liberty to reject it, if it can not stand a fair trial. Only, as he professes to be a sincere inquirer, I would have him inquire whether it may not, after all, be a good distinction, and a very apposite phrase, fitted to set aside error that had appeared, or to body forth dis-

tinctly some great truth which had been denied; and, if it does, he may as well keep it till he gets a better. But, on the other hand, this is not a time to fight for additions, which theologians may have made, on the pretense that they are buttresses of the truth. I for one do not feel that I am called on to fight for the supplements which men, even great and good men, have made to divine truth. There is a curse pronounced, at the close of the Book of Revelation, against those who diminish aught from it: "If any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophesy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book." But there is a curse pronounced equally on those who would add: "For I testify to every man that heareth the words of the prophesy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues which are written in this book." When our Lord was preaching His holy doctrine, the timid disciples came to Him in alarm, and said that the Scribes and Pharisees were offended. "But he answered, and said, Every plant which my Heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up." This is an age in which God seems to be saying, "I will overturn, overturn, overturn," which signifieth the removing of those things that are shaken as of things that are made, that those things which can not be shaken may remain. I do hope that, by these collisions and rubbings, some of the sharper and more bristling points of our traditional belief may be ground down. Keeping our Bible as the Word of God, we may be restrained from interpreting it in so narrow a spirit.

Instead of counting the words or letters, as if we were Jewish rabbis, or exercising our logical ingenuity, in drawing out long and minute doctrinal deductions by human reasoning, we may be more profitably employed in explaining it fairly and honestly, and not according to a preconceived system, in apprehending its broad and simple meaning, and finally falling under its quickening and regenerating power. We Scotchmen will surely be made to feel, in these times, that we can not remain satisfied with the mere form of religion. We who live in other lands know how often it is brought as a reproach against our countrymen, that they have been satisfied with their orthodox creed, with their attendance at the house of God, and their reverence for the Bible and the Sabbath. This it is that gives a pretext to the enemies of the Evan-

gelical religion, when they declare that religious professors are no better than others, and to affirm that if Jesus were among us, He would address ministers and people, "Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites." Such a formal religion is offensive to man, even as it is displeasing to God. "Ye are the salt of the earth: but if the salt have lost its savor, wherewith shall it be salted? it is thenceforward good for nothing but to be cast out and trodden under foot." By the very opposition offered, we are made to see and acknowledge, feel and realize, what is the nature and what the essence of religion, and to know that the spirit of religion is the spirit of Jesus. And if Christ be exalted, and love be exalted, I do not care what else, what individuals, or even what Churches be abased. "Say not, then, what is the cause that the former days were better than these, for thou dost not inquire wisely concerning this."

There are some ever telling us that the theology of former times is so much superior to that of our day. Some prefer the theology of the so-called fathers of the Church, some that of the Reformation, some that of the Puritans. Now, I believe that it may be good for us to look at the way in which great and good men have conceived, expressed, and enforced the truth in divers ages, were it only to widen our narrow views, and recall attention to catholic verities which particular ages or sects have allowed to sink out of sight. Let us, by all means, rise, from time to time, above the contracted valleys in which we dwell, and ascend a hight whence we may observe the whole broad and diversified territory which God has given us as an inheritance, and the relation of the varied parts which branch out from Christ as the center, as do the hills and valleys of our country from some great mountain, the axis of its range. There is, we should acknowledge, an attractive simplicity in the exposition of divine truth by the early fathers; and we are under deep obligations to the divines of the fourth century for establishing, on Scripture evidence, the doctrine of the Trinity. Those who look into it, with a desire to discover what is good, will find not a little even in the mediæval divinity, notwithstanding the restraints laid on it by crutches and bandages. It is not to be forgotten that Thomas a Kempis lived in what are called the dark ages, and that we owe to a philosopic divine of those times (Anselm), not, certainly, the doctrine of the atonement, which had been in the revealed religion of God since Adam and

Abel offered lambs in sacrifice, but a more masterly and comprehensive exposition of that cardinal truth than had been previously given. The grace which had been so limited and hindered in the priestly and ecclesiastical ages breathes, from every page of the Reformers, as fragrance does from the flower. The Puritan preaching is unsurpassed in clear enunciation of divine truth, accompanied with close searching and fervent appeal, which now shakes the whole soul as the earthquake did the prison at Philippi, and anon relieves it by the command and promise, "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." But we should put implicit confidence in no human, or hereditary, or traditional theology; in no theology, indeed, except what comes direct from the Bible, interpreted according to the letter, but received after the spirit. How often does it happen that you will know what sect a man belongs to by the favorite passages which he quotes in his sermons and in his very prayers, showing how apt we are to take our very Scriptures from the traditions of our Churches. We act as if the well were shut out from us, and as if we were obliged to go to the streams which may have caught earthliness in their course, and which, at the best, can not be so fresh as the fountain.

That is the theology best suited to the age which is put forth by living men of the age, drinking of the living Word for themselves by the power of the living Spirit. There are persons, in our day, ever telling us that the old theology of Scotland was, in many respects, defective. Our old Scotch divines, and those who follow them, have not, they say, set forth Christ with sufficient prominence as a living person in his love and sympathy, and as the proper object of faith. They declare that, as many in the last century, and the beginning of this, preached a cold morality, and not the Savior, so are not a few in this age preaching formal doctrine, and not Christ. Now, I am not inclined to say that there is no justice in this reproof. No believer should allow himself to blame those who, with a genuine heart, would magnify the person of the Savior. Certainly, they can not be wrong who make Christ the head; when he is there, he keeps all else. He keeps doctrine; he keeps the Church; he keeps ordinances in their proper place, in an honored but still subordinate place, as members of his mystical body. So far as this new theology, of which we hear so much, errs, as I believe it does err, it is not in what it incul-

cates, but in what it omits; not in what it teaches, but in what it does not teach; not in what it affirms, but in what it denies. It does not err in exalting Christ; it does not err in saying that our faith must not be in a doctrine about Christ, but a faith in Christ himself; it can not err in seeking to present Christ before us in his fullness of life and all his attractiveness. Where it errs, as I fear it does err, in some quarters, is in exhibiting a mutilated Christ. It calls our attention to certain lovely features of his character, and here it can not be wrong; but it leaves out others, and deadly error must come in at the open gap. In particular, it is losing sight of the expiatory character of the work and sufferings of the Redeemer. And, verily, I can not at all understand my Lord's life or death; I can not comprehend those deep groans, that fearful agony, that exceeding sorrow even unto death, that awful cloud on the Father's face, till I connect them with my sins. I believe the burden is off me when I see it laid on him who bore our sins in his own body on the tree. In reading certain books published in our day, and hearing certain sermons, I am inclined to say with the young Isaac, "Here is the fire and the wood, but where is the lamb for a burnt-offering?" How relieved am I when I hear the declaration, "My son, God will provide." His name is Jehovah-Jireh. He has the living lamb for the burnt-offering. While we retain our Bible divine and inspired, and so distinguished from every other book, I think we see more fully that we are at liberty, and that we should be ready to accept lessons from every quarter, from nature and from history, from literature and from art.

I met, the other day, with the following extract from a work where some would not expect it: "So often," says John Calvin, in his Institutes, "as we look into profane writers, let us be admonished, by that light of truth which shines forth admirably in them, that the mind of man, however much it may have fallen and been perverted from its integrity, is still clothed and adorned with excellent gifts of God. If we consider the Spirit of God the sole fountain of truth, we shall neither reject nor contemn that truth wherever it appears, unless we choose to be contemptuous to the Spirit of God. For the gifts of the Spirit are not reviled without contempt and opprobrium of the Spirit himself. What, shall we deny that truth shone upon those ancient jurists who set forth, with so much correctness, the order and dis-

cipline of civil life? Shall we say that philosophers have been blinded, both in their exquisite contemplation of nature and in their artistic description of her beauties? Shall we say that capacity was wanting to those who, elaborating the art of discourse, have taught us to speak in accordance with reason?"* We may be allowed to remember that Stephen tells us how the founder of the Hebrew Commonwealth was "learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians," and the principal propagator of the Christian faith in Europe was acquainted with both Jewish and Greek learning, and quoted, when it served his purpose, from the Grecian poets. We may surely, without being reckoned heathens, be ready to receive some instruction from Socrates as to the beauty of virtue and the wisdom of Providence; and, without being regarded as profane, allow Shakspeare to unfold to us the infinite varieties of human character. The narrow Church may here learn something from the broad Church.

All this, however, must be on the condition that, while we take from the world, we must beware of accommodating ourselves to it, or catching its spirit. We must guard against the temptation of trying to serve both God and the world, even though that world should be the world of literature, the world of scholarship. Religion serves its high end, not by going down to the level of the world, but standing above it, and seeking to draw it up to its own elevation. The attempt, renewed from age to age, of gaining the world by descending to it, has ever turned out to be a vain one. When it acts otherwise; when, Samson-like, it yields to seduction and betrays its secret, it is quickly deprived of its vision, and becomes the object of mockery and scorn. "If the salt have lost its savor, wherewith shall it be salted? It is thenceforth good for nothing but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of man." What we take from the world must, like ourselves, be converted and baptized before it can enter the kingdom; must "be born of water and of the Spirit." But, cherishing this spirit, our ears should not be stopped to any sound of loveliness; our eyes should be opened to every hue of beauty, to every form of gracefulness. All the works of God, in particular, are ready to instruct us, and we should receive impressions for good from the

* This passage is quoted from the *Weekly Review*, for which it was translated from Calvin's Latin.

stars of heaven, from the lilies of the field, from "all sheep and oxen; yea, and the beasts of the field, the fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea, and whatsoever passeth through the paths of the sea." "Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report, if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things."

I am in hopes that another beneficial effect will flow from this state of things. There may occur in an individual's life an event fitted to make the man or woman review the whole past, and form entirely new life purposes for the future. We are arrived, I rather think, at such an era in the history of the Church—an era when Christians are called to review the condition of the Church in general, and, what is more difficult, to review the position of their own sect. Let me ask, Is the professing Church of Christ in the state in which it ought to be; in the state in which you should like it to be? I rather think that the answer of every one will be that it is not. All will declare that they could wish it improved. But then I ask, further, How do you expect to improve it? Perhaps some will reply, Oh, it would be improved if it were after the model of my own denomination. But, without inquiring what ground you can have for hoping that the Church at large is likely to be converted to your denominational views, I put a more pointed question, Are you satisfied with your own denomination, that it is, in every respect, as it should be? Would the Church universal be altogether after the pattern shown in the New Testament, provided only it were after the model of our sect? Perhaps the reply now is that this would be the case, provided our denomination were what it should be. This brings us to the point that, as the Church at large, so each denomination is not what it should be. And why so anxious, you say, to establish this point? Not, certainly, for the purpose of making any discontented with their sect, or their fellowship, or their minister, because not perfect; but solely to make us long and pray for a better state of things; to make us ready to look, every one, not merely on his own affairs, but on those of others also, and prepare to consider how the scattered forces of the Church may be, I do not say incorporated, but combined for the common good.

I am cherishing the expectation that, in front of a formidable

enemy, Christians of different Evangelical denominations may be made to combine, first in action, then in spirit and sentiment, and, in the end, in fellowship. I am convinced that God has some great purpose to accomplish by allowing this restless feeling to spring up, this understood combination to be formed against the Church. I was greatly struck, lately, in reading the language ascribed to Abraham Lincoln, as to the awful struggles going on in America: "I claim not," says he, "to have controlled events, but confess, plainly, that events have controlled me. Now, at the end of three years' struggle, the nation's condition is not what either party, or any man, devised or expected. God alone can claim it. Whither it is tending seems plain. If God now wills the removal of a great wrong, and wills, also, that we of the North, as well as of the South, shall pay fairly for our complicity in that wrong, impartial history will find therein new cause to attest and revere the justice and goodness of God." Just as the American conflict seems to be working for the ultimate destruction of slavery, without the parties having contemplated it, so these contests within the Church, and attacks from without, appear to be intended by God to constrain the living members of Christ's Church to come to a clearer understanding, and to enter into a closer union; of all which the glory will belong to God, as it has not been the end designed by men. The Evangelical Alliance has not, perhaps, been visibly a great power—at least, in the view of the world; but, invisibly and inaudibly, it has exercised not a little influence for good; and, in our world, the unseen and the silent forces are, after all, the most efficacious. The light which comes so pleasantly from the sun produces greater effects than the lightning with its thunders; the gently-flowing stream has in its course more influence than the rushing waterfall. Supposing the Church of Christ to be represented by the "wheel in the midst of a wheel," seen in vision by Ezekiel, I believe the Evangelical Alliance has, by its prayers and the spirit which it has diffused, supplied an oil which has helped to keep the wheels from creaking, and made the machine move on with more ease and greater velocity. If it has not produced universal love, it has, at least, softened asperities; it has quietly created a public sentiment, and given expression to that sentiment. If it has not accomplished union, it has made Christians long for union, and prepared the way for coming unions. It is a favorite idea, in the present day,

that all the physical forces are modifications of one power, which shines in the light, which warms in the fire, which attracts planet to sun and sun to sun, which lives in the planet and moves in the animal. This one force, appearing in such diverse modes of action, is an expressive emblem of the one spirit, which lives, and breathes, and energizes in the Church of God, manifesting itself in divers ways, in different individuals and different Churches; but, after all, one, essentially one, and making the Church one; so that this is still part of our creed, though at times forgotten by Protestants, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church."

PROGRESS OF THE GOSPEL IN INDIA.

The conversion of every idolater or Mohammedan counts in Asia for far more than the spiritual conversion in Europe of an individual nominally Christian. Each Hindoo is held fast by the whole force of the native superstition; hence his conversion is a triumph over the whole might of paganism, and creates a sensation throughout the entire fabric of society. Every addition, therefore, to the body of converts increases the moral force opposed to heathen opinion in a constantly increasing ratio.

The reception given to the Gospel in any country depends, in a great measure, upon the activity of the national conscience, developing the sense of sin, and awakening the desire for pardon and salvation. The Hindoo conscience has been wholly perverted by ages of abominable heathenism. It is now being reformed and created anew by the operation of European thought, and, especially, by the action of the law courts. In every province our government administers a civil and criminal code, formed by Christian jurists; and, since the natives are very litigious, they learn in these law courts the Christian definitions of right and wrong. Their crimes and vices are exposed and punished by the magistrate, and the national conscience is thus prepared for the operation of the Gospel. The law entered, that the offense might abound; but where sin abounded, grace will much more abound. In this case, as in the history of Israel, the law is a schoolmaster, to bring the Indian nations to Christ.

Christian Spectator, October, 1864.

CHRIST AND THE DOCTORS; OR, FAITH v. PHILOSOPHY.*

BY PETER BAYNE, A. M.

If the Christian religion is, as all here believe, divine, it can not at any time be, strictly speaking, in danger; but it is possible that a crisis may be reached in its history, and there are good grounds for asserting that, in the present day, such a crisis has arrived—a crisis so important that, in order to find a parallel for it, we must go back some two thousand years. The time has come when it must be finally determined whether civilization is to put Christianity aside, and endeavor to do without it, or whether civilized nations, led by their most intelligent and earnest minds, are to regard it as a thing settled and unalterable, that Christianity is true, and that the civilization of the future ought to be imbued with its influence more thoroughly than the civilization of the past.

Two thousand years ago, the civilized nations of Europe, the Greeks and Romans, had arrived at a point at which it was necessary for them to determine, in reference to their popular religion, a similar problem; and it came before them, viewed broadly, in much the same way as that in which it now comes before us in relation to Christianity. The classical nations, at the time referred to, had passed through those earlier stages of national life, during which doubt respecting religious matters is practically unknown. The speculative force of their cultivated intellect had been long employed in proving that the popular religion could not be rationally held; and the proof of this proposition had been effected not only to the satisfaction of a few superior minds, but so completely and so clearly as to diffuse a vague persuasion, through all classes, that it was established. The Olympian mythology, with its whole apparatus of priests and oracles—with its splendid and graceful imagery, which put a bright living existence into the chariot of the sun, which made the wind-borne cloud a couch for radiant goddesses, and, in the gleam and shadow of the deep wood, saw whispering shapes of beauty—was quietly known

* Read at the meeting of the Evangelical Alliance in Edinburgh, July, 1864.

by all to be a growth of legend and of poetry. What, then, was to be done? All those men of culture and intellectual power, in whom the element of conscience, the element of moral aspiration and resolve, had any strength, simply put aside this fair drapery which had overhung the heavens, and fell back upon a religion of nature—a religion which had little or nothing to say of celestial intelligences, but which had vigorous notions as to the duty of man the individual, and of man as a member of society. At that time—at all times, unless there exist influences which destroy the natural health of the mind, and introduce a kind of moral insanity, which seems to have been partly the case with Mirabeau and Byron—men of a high order were in favor of virtue. This is true of all the serious and important schools of ancient philosophy. Provision was made for the maintenance of virtue as well in what we are accustomed to call the sty of Epicurus as in the palace of thought, I had almost said the temple of worship, reared by Plato. Such men as Plato and Epicurus, as Cicero and Seneca, had no fierce or aggressive animosity against the religion of the priests. They were willing to extract from the old legends, which had been arrayed in a garment of immortal beauty by Homer and Hesiod, all they might contain of abstract ethical truth, or of shrewd admonition for the guidance of men in the intercourse of life. Hints from a thousand sources might be useful in working out that religion of nature which wise men were to obey. And let it be distinctly allowed, that not a few of the eminent men of antiquity, though they never approached the Christian standard, did succeed in framing for themselves a lucid and creditable scheme of natural morals, and in personally attaining to what may be called a respectable standard of virtue. Cicero, Seneca, and men of that stamp, were really respectable gentlemen, who took care that the folds of their toga should fall with considerable gracefulness of curve, and should have, if possible, no visible stain. It is better, no doubt, to put no impertinent questions of a personal nature on the subject of their virtue. It was for show rather than use. Seneca was probably, in moral respects, essentially such a man as Talbot Twysden, Esq., of Thackeray's last completed novel.

Still, I repeat, the lives of the philosophic moralists of Greece and Rome, who had flung aside the popular superstitions, who believed in no supernatural power, who, on the whole, contented themselves with the creed that it was good to be good, and that

you were to define goodness as best you might, were respectable; and it might plausibly have been maintained, that if society in general became as they were, things would rub on pretty well. It is, indeed—I may remark, in passing—acknowledged, so far as I am aware, by all scholars, that this frosty philosophic faith had no power whatever over the mass of men; that the exploded superstitions, with all their absurdity, with all their indissoluble association with vice, had been incomparably more effectual in promoting social virtue than the authority of the schools; and that, at the very time when the philosophic moralists were basking with most satisfaction in the religion of nature, the world around them, having lost hold of the old faith, and not able to comprehend the philosophic substitute, was becoming a scene of unutterable and inconceivable immorality, a reeking cess-pool of abominations.

Just at this point, the questions at issue between the priests and the philosophers were determined in a way unexpected by either. A new religion claimed possession of the world; a new cycle commenced in the history of civilization. Christian ages began to run. For centuries, for many centuries, speculative doubt on the fundamental questions of religion was, for all practical purposes, unknown in Europe. But stage after stage of culture was passed; the reverential, childlike times went by; and, at last, after some sixteen centuries, the intelligence of Europe, full of strength and daring, like a young poet—shall I say, like a Schiller, attempting to pry into the sources of the lightning or the light?—looked with piercing, searching gaze into Christianity, and asked what right *it* had to proclaim itself the one true, divine religion. Since the latter part of the seventeenth century, this question has been continually put, and it admits of no doubt or disguise that—now for at least a hundred years—we have had in Europe a succession of really gifted men, a succession of kings in the world of thought, who have brought up what is strictly a new edition of the theory and practice of the philosophic moralists of Greece and Rome, and have maintained that, casting aside Christianity as a faith, men may, with highest advantage to themselves, intellectually and morally, live under a religion of nature.

In the language of this school, wise men are to pass out of the region of cloud and shadow, and to emerge under the blue sky of nature. It is not necessary to their position that they should scorn or vituperate Christianity. On the contrary, they are pre-

pared to take the utmost advantage of it, as well as of what is abstractly and ethically good in all positive religions. Their relation to Christianity is defined with exquisite precision by Goethe, when he says that, for him, the doctrine of grace, the Gospel, is a brook or well, clear and beautiful, of cool and refreshing water, from which, as from many other wells, he is glad to drink in his life-journey, but beside which he will not linger, and which is by no means the only well in which the heaven, with its eternal stars, can glass itself. With the advantage, then, over the ancient philosophic moralists of two thousand additional years of world-history; with the advantage of all that the human mind has, in that period, realized in art, in literature, in philosophy, of the Good, the True, the Beautiful; above all, with the advantage of Christian instead of Olympian ethics, the natural, non-Christian moralists of the day propose to frame for themselves a religion of nature, which shall quietly supersede Christianity. When I speak of framing or constructing a religion of nature, however, let me not convey a false idea of what I mean. It is only in rare cases, and to a limited extent, that the representatives of the school would pledge themselves to any positive work of construction. Mr. Carlyle's position, that "the ultimate task of literature is to produce a Bible," does, indeed, seem to imply that the perogative which Christians have hitherto attributed to God should, in all its details, be assigned to man. But the maturer opinion of Mr. Carlyle himself, as given in his Life of John Sterling, would, to say the least, relieve literature, in constructing its Bible, of all necessity of answering, with certitude, those questions touching the existence and personality of God, the state of man in God's sight, and the destinies of the human race, for which we look in Divine Revelation. The school eschews the settlement of all fact as to supernal existence, and of all dogma as to the duty of man to God. Literature, if it did not produce its Bible, would be its ministering high-priest, constantly producing imaginative pictures, or ethical propositions, or moving sentiments, or judicious practical counsels, which, together, would constitute the many-glancing light of this religion of nature. Only one thing would be fixed—that whatever religion man might have, he would make for himself, or find for himself, or have every day anew suggested to him from his own conscience, from literature, science, art, and all positive creeds. Religion would thus be the moral consciousness, the

sentiment of duty, purified by all natural means, but illuminated by no light from heaven. It would be non-supernatural—that is, a first principle; beyond that all is doubtful. Under minor differences, whether they call themselves idealists or materialists, pantheists or positivists, all those who refuse to accept Christianity as a supernatural system meet on the platform of this broad hypothesis. Goethe and Strauss, Carlyle and Renan, Rousseau and Comte, agree in this. On the other hand, those who are Christians in the strict sense maintain that Christianity, as the one divine religion, is specifically true, and can never be superseded. These are the sides of a controversy on which depends the future of civilization. The grand question has been discussed, as I said, for about two hundred years. The discussion has now reached a crisis, and I think that, within the next half century, it will, one way or the other, be settled.

Christians have no just cause to be alarmed as to the issue. I do not, of course, refer to their personal faith, that the Almighty will preserve the religion He has revealed to the world. I mean that the actual, visible state of the conflict is not fitted to depress; that the Christian intrenchments have not been carried; that every assault yet delivered has been repulsed; and that there is no likelihood that attacks more formidable will be delivered in the future. But I shall indicate, in one or two words, a few of the considerations of a practical and what may be called tangible kind, which have produced and confirmed in me the conviction that Christianity will not give way to any elaboration of a religion of nature.

First of all, it can not be shown that our modern non-Christian moralists have improved, in any particular, upon the ethics of Christianity. The abstract moral system of the old philosophers was, unquestionably, purer and better than, and, therefore, had a right to supersede, the popular fables about Jupiter and Venus. But it has always been found that, no sooner did a modern non-Christian moralist point out and dwell upon a principle of natural ethics, really sound and noble, than the principle in question proved to be an integral part of Christianity. Very pure and beautiful is the moralizing of Fichte on the disinterested character of virtue; very plausible, at the first glance, is his position that Christianity, with hell and its heaven, is a selfish religion, and can not be divine. But look a little deeper into Christianity; apprehend it to any extent as it was apprehended by Paul and John;

discern that it is a *life*, not a service, a labor of *love*, not a labor for wages, and you discover that Fichte's position may be, and ought to be, particularly insisted upon in Christian pulpits. Most profound and most impressive is Goethe's moralizing on what he calls the divine depth of sorrow, and fine and penetrating are the thoughts of Carlyle on the same theme. But all this only brings out one aspect of the teaching of Gethsemane and of Calvary. Mr. John Stuart Mill has a remarkable expression of opinion on this point. He says that there is no virtue, no sound ethical doctrine, with which Christianity can not contrive to reconcile itself. I suppose he means to hint that, whenever a natural moralist turns out a good thing, some glib and ingenious Christian apologist will make it appear that Christians knew it beforehand, and will show its consistency with scriptural ethics. But, taking it even so, I submit that a religion which appeared in Judea, and was preached by a few mechanics two thousand years ago, and which does not contradict the ethical discoveries of the human mind in any possible development—and this is Mr. Mill's admission—has a very strong claim to be thought divine. Of no religion that ever appeared in this world, except Christianity, would any man make the statement made by Mr. Mill.

In the second place, it can be shown that whenever moralists of the naturalist, non-Christian school have ventured to depart from the Christian type, from the spirit or the letter of Christian ethics, they have substituted not a better teaching, but a worse. It is impossible for me to enter here upon details, but those who are well acquainted with the works of Goethe and of Mr. Carlyle will know to what I refer. In some of the principal works, Goethe has, to say the least, hinted at doctrines which revolt the moral sense of humanity; and, although Mr. Carlyle has nobly eulogized the moral heroism of Christianity, yet, when he builds a hero-throne for a Mirabeau, a Danton, a Frederick of Prussia, it becomes apparent that his ethical guiding lights are not so steady nor so pure as those by which he was led when he delineated a Martin Luther or an Oliver Cromwell.

In the third place, it is as certain now as it was in the days when pagan superstition lost its hold on the minds of men, that a religion disconnected with definite belief in responsibility to God, in the future existence of man, in Divine sanctions annexed to virtue and threatenings to vice, and in a moral law commanding

man to do this, and to forbear from that, will fail to control the mass of men. The wild horses of passion have always spurned the silken harnessings of philosophical morality; and man has ever made light of conscience, except when he believed it to speak for God. It is, probably, because Mr. Carlyle, the historian of the French Revolution, knows, in his heart of hearts, that this is an unquestionable fact; that, though he will not accept Christianity, he is scornfully conscious of, nor anxious to hide his consciousness of, the practical impotence of philosophical systems of morality.

In the fourth place, and most important of all, we can deliberately affirm that, in the arena of argument, the facts on which Christianity rests have not only never been refuted, but have never been fairly confronted. When I refer to the facts on which Christianity is based, I mean the facts of the life of Christ, the facts by which He showed that the power of the universe was in His hand, the facts that He raised the dead and stilled the tempest, and was, in all things, a present God. This is the essential question. All else is secondary to this. And the position of the naturalists in regard to it is accurately exhibited in that taken up by Ernest Renan. Every one who has glanced into his book knows that he does not look the proof of Christ's miracles in the face. He has been taught, by the experience of countless assailants of Christianity, not to do that. He has been admonished, by the shattered fragments of a thousand infidel arguments lying round him, not to do that. He makes himself wings of theory, and flies lightly over the particular question. He leaves the Christian argument, in so far as it relates to the particular evidence of definite, cardinal facts, untouched. It may be alleged at this moment, with express, irresistible proof, that Christians offer to meet infidel critics on the fair field of scientific evidence, and that infidels will not accept the challenge.

I confess, for my part, that I rejoice to see the Christian argument returning once more to the simple issue of fact. I know a little—I shall not say much, but enough, I think, to enable me to judge—of what may be called—and I use the words not in a bad, but a good sense—the ethico-sentimental school of Christian apologists. The writers referred to are those who dwell with emphasis, nay with exclusiveness, on those aspects of Christianity, which render it attractive to finer and higher natures, to all who love virtue for its own sake, and whose hearts thrill responsive to

the noble, generous, heroic sentiment. They expatiate on the elevated character of its morality; they show its nice adaptation to the wants and aspiration of man; they bring out, tone after tone, gleam after gleam, that poetry, which its tenderness, like the touch of morning on the Egyptian stone, draws from the rugged human heart. All this is good. Perfectly legitimate it is to point out that Christianity, apart from all questions respecting its origin, viewed merely as a something which is here, has irresistible claims to be considered divine. If the face and form are radiant with heaven, if the eye and lip are divinely beautiful, if the message is one of celestial wisdom, and the accents are those of an angel of God, why should we not accept Christianity as divine, though no human eye saw when the heavenly visitant stepped from the cloud upon the horizon of our world? The ethico-sentimental apologists of Christianity are capable of doing much good, and I have no fear that they will do much evil. But I can not disguise my preference for that old-fashioned school of apologists, who have proceeded on the principle that the question on which the claims of Christianity must radically and ultimately be decided is a question of fact. Looking at the matter *a priori*, recollecting how practical is Nature in all her ways—how, a few feet beneath her softest green and most dewy flowers, you will always come on rocks—I should have expected it to be so. Speaking with reverence and humility, I should have expected the God of nature, in giving evidence of the world-religion, to proceed on such principles, that the mass of mankind could be turned into the jury-box to decide upon its validity. So it is. Christianity, as a religion resting fundamentally on historical fact, appeals to the broadest stratum of human intelligence, to that robust shrewdness, to that unsophisticated sense, which, if deficient in the finer feelings, can, at least, adjudicate upon fact. Of the kind of man to whom I allude, no better type can be found than the Duke of Wellington, and, if I looked for a representative of the other order of mind, I should, perhaps, be not far wrong in selecting one furnished, in the person of one of his characters, by an eminent and popular writer of fiction, the Rev. Charles Kingsley. I have seldom been more struck than by the contrast between the estimate formed by the Duke of Wellington, on the one hand, and that formed by Alton Locke, on the other; of the merits of that Christian apologist who, whether specifically

successful or otherwise—and I am far from saying that, with our present critical knowledge, his argument can be deemed exhaustive—has discussed the question of Christianity pointedly and preëminently as a question of fact. I allude, of course, to Paley. The Duke of Wellington—it was when he was in India, the laurels of Assaye probably still green upon his brow—once heard a frothy colonel or captain pouring forth infidel commonplaces on the subject of Christianity. Wellington quietly asked him whether he had read Paley's Evidences of Christianity. No, he had not. The Duke advised him to read the book before he made up his mind respecting Christianity. In Mr. Kingsley's novel we find precisely the same advice given to Alton Locke as the Duke of Wellington, that Sir Arthur Wellesley, gave to the colonel. But Alton Locke is far too fine a person to care what Paley may have said. The author of the *Horæ Paulinæ* is not, by any means, the ideal apologist who can give satisfaction to his richly emotioned soul. He refuses to read Paley. Wellington, one of the greatest practical minds that has belonged to the human race, saw, as an indubitable fact, that the religion which could say for itself what Paley said for it was based upon substantial evidence. The Duke of Wellington wrote no poetry, and never went into raptures about pictures; but he is an unexceptionable representative of the common sense, the common justice, and, if I may say, the common logic of mankind, and I think there is no fear of Christianity so long as it can challenge the verdict of a jury of Wellington.

If I might offer a practical suggestion or two in reference to the way in which we ought to support ourselves in this controversy between Christianity and skepticism, I should say, to begin with, that we ought to maintain calmness of mind, cherish clear and manly conceptions of religion, and avoid "the falsehood of extremes." Extremes of the worst kind, in connection with this subject, may be roughly classified as those which tend, on the one hand, to Romanism, and, on the other, to infidelity; and, in order to understand what those extremes are, we can not do better than contemplate a representative mind in each of the polar opposites. Let us be fair to Romanism and to infidelity, choosing favorable representatives of each. Let them be Ernest Renan, on the one side, and John Henry Newman, the ablest Roman Catholic, I believe, in existence, on the other. What is the religion of Renan? It is an indefinable sentiment, a vague ideal emanation, partly

from the brain, and partly from the heart. What is the religion of Newman? It is a rigid algebraical formula. The one is, in his own conceit, so superlative a being, so richly intellectual, so nobly emotional, so capable of discovering truth, that he hardly pays God the compliment to recognize His existence, and deems it mere superstition to fear Him. The other has so overpowering a sense of the baseness and badness of the world, that he can not believe the Revelation of the Son of Man, unaided by an infallible Church, capable of saving it. The religion of the one is all vapor; the religion of the other is all rock. The religion of the one is a rosy mist, and from this mist, brooding over the blue hills of Palestine, exhaled from it, as the witch of the Alps, in Byron's poem, was, to use Wilson's words, exhaled from the spray of the fountain, arose his imaginary Christ; the religion of the other is a thing of gloom and terror, a shadow beneath which men peep, and cower, and tremble. Not to dissipate the darkness, but to make it a darkness visible and that may be felt, arises the Church, announcing, as Dr. Newman says, that it were better that the sun and moon fell from heaven, better that all mankind should die of starvation in extreme agonies of physical torment, than that one venial sin should be committed. Now, there *is* a darkness enveloping humanity. But let us be sure that the darkness which we recognize as embracing the world is, so to speak, the normal night of humanity; a darkness not killing man's spiritual existence; a darkness comprehended in the mighty plan of Divine Providence. How shall we distinguish between this darkness and the sepulchral gloom in which Dr. Newman clothes the world? The darkest night, I answer, that ever fell over this earth, never hid the stars, never *put out the light;* it only made the stars more visible, more keenly, kindly glancing, as if in protest *against* the darkness. Only when a vail came up from our world, only when the clouds arose, only when the gloom was earth-born, did it hide the stars. Let us apply this test in the moral world. Does the darkness *put out the light?* does it annihilate the proof that God is love? does it show the world to be a failure, and cause despair to hang the heavens with black? Then is it a thing of morbid human imagination, an impossibility in God's world, and such is the blackness which Dr. Newman conjures up, showing us only the "infallible" Church, toiling and toiling conspicuously in vain to irradicate the gloom.

There may be extremes, also, in the very manner and temper,

in the particular and detailed tactics with which this infidel controversy is conducted by Christians. We can, I think, derive a useful hint on this point from what may be called the strategical methods of two members of the animal creation, the crab and the lobster, as described, with exquisite humor, by Hugh Miller. The crab is always for war. It flares up the moment an attack is even threatened, goes into a towering passion, returns the assault without discrimination, grips at any thing it can can catch, holds on though it is dragged from its hole, and, by sheer passionate blindness, works its own destruction. I think we have examples of crab-like pugnacity, and crab-like passion and indiscrimination, among very excellent, very earnest Christians. The lobster adopts an entirely different system of tactics. He yields, and that with an impetuous readiness. If a limb is seized, he throws it off—"take it, take it, only spare my life." So far good, or at least not necessarily bad. But the lobster is apt to overdo his discretion. Sometimes, in mere causeless panic—as, for instance, if you fire a musket over him—he will throw off limb after limb, only losing his weapons, and deriving no advantage from their surrender. Now, I can not help thinking that some Christian apologists are apt to adopt these panic tactics of the lobster. If only some pretentious book appears, some huge sound from a Darwin or a Renan, they think that all is over, and are prepared to make any concessions. The "grand old gardener and his wife," as Tennyson says, must be deposed at once, and a male and female gorilla put in their place. The development of all things from half an inch of cometary vapor is to be viewed as established. We are to yield, yield, yield. This, also, is a foolish extreme, and one into which we are very apt to fall in the present day. In all cases, and at all times, we must yield what is false, and defend what is true.

One other word, and I have done. While we can not possibly be too firm, definite, or emphatic in our affirmation that the Christian religion is supernatural and Divine, let us beware of too dogmatic a certainty that *we* understand, in all relations and aspects, the manner in which the Almighty has given Divine revelation to man. Let us, on that point, reverently and faithfully take the commentary of God's works upon His Word, holding by the Head, sure that all contradictions, all difficulties will be solved in Christ, and convinced that "God is His own interpreter, and He will make it plain" that His Word and His works agree.

HOW TO USE THE GOSPELS.*

BY HENRY ALFORD, B. D., DEAN OF CANTERBURY.

"How to use the Gospels" is an important inquiry; for it is precisely those that know least of them who know that little worst—know it carelessly, unintelligently, unprofitably. And as we advance upward, through the ranks of those who know more, how fragmentary, how insufficient is, commonly, that knowledge! How much do almost all persons whom we meet, in ordinary society, want teaching how to use the Gospels, so as to make them serve the purposes for which they were intended!

For be it remembered, that God has not given us these inspired records of our Lord's life and teaching, in their present form, without a beneficent purpose. He might have given us *one* indubitable, plain historic account. But he has given us *four*. These four might have been found in exact verbal accord as to every incident in our Lord's life, and every word spoken by him; but they differ, and sometimes widely, in the expression, even where facts and things said are, evidently, the same. These Gospels, as they were written by the inspired authors, might have come down to us without any variety of reading in different authorities. They *have* come down to us, with many thousand such varieties, of greater or less importance. They might have been, by Divine inspiration, rendered into all the languages on earth; whereas they exist in verbal accuracy in one ancient language only, and the Churches of modern times have to accept and read them in fallible human versions.

It is with such points as these that the present series of papers will mainly deal. The writer finds them, in very great part, set aside and ignored. Even in societies where information and intelligence on all ordinary matters are indispensable, any degree of ignorance on this matter passes muster without bringing reproach. The utmost that seems expected, even from the clergy themselves, is to be able to affirm that the *Scripture* says so and so. But *what* Scripture says it; with what intent; how far, in

---

* From the *Sunday Magazine*, October, 1864.

the words quoted, the context is duly had in regard; whether they do or do not rightly represent the sense of the original—these things not one *clergyman* in ten seems to take into account; still less those laymen who would be ashamed to quote, in the same slovenly manner, any of the well-known classical authors. And as to ordinary English readers of the Gospels, it is not too much to say, that the way in which they use them seems to proceed on the assumption that there is but one Gospel, not four; that that one has been delivered down to us entire and indisputable in every point and in one form, and that form the English version, as published by King James's translators.

Now, the present writer does not mean, for a moment, to say that the Holy Gospels may not be used for the confirmation of the faith, and the nourishment of the inner life, in the manner with which he is now finding fault. Blessed be God, they are so full of rich food for the soul, the seeds of Divine truth lie so thickly scattered over them, and the affections are so powerfully drawn to Him who is their great subject, that even the most inadequate use of them, in the most imperfect version, may serve to bring souls to God; nay, more—that even a crumb of the blessed Bread of Life may sustain and recreate the man. Many a fainting spirit, in weakness and ignorance, has gathered strength from even one text of Holy Writ, treasured up and often thought on; and that, too, when the one text itself has not, perhaps, been so apprehended as to carry its full or even its proper meaning.

But it is not of *bare sustenance* that we are now speaking. We are not inquiring *how little* use of the Gospels is compatible with life unto God. On the contrary, we would wish to be understood as endeavoring to set forth the provision here made for us, in all its wonderful fullness and in its manifold variety, and as inquiring how we may best avail ourselves of *every* means of profiting by God's revelation of His blessed Son. Therefore, let nothing here said be understood as casting doubt or depreciation upon the blessing which may accrue even from the most inadequate use of the Gospels. My anxiety is, if it may be, to point out how Scripture may be better used, and God more honored, than is commonly the case; how we may not lose the things we have wrought, but receive our full reward; how Christ's Church, whose work for God, by the Spirit dwelling in

her, these Scriptures are, may gain the utmost from them, and receive the Divine treasure in full.

I would put in one more caution, and it is this: Let not any thing here said be supposed, in the least degree, to impugn the truth of the special inspiration of the writers of Holy Scripture by the Spirit of God. It seems to me that it is assuming far too much, respecting our knowledge of the mode and process of that inspiration, to tie it down to conditions such as we are compelled to lay down for human narration. How it wrought in the sacred writers we are unable to say, except that it was the especial influence of the Spirit of Truth. We are certain that each of the Gospel narratives is, in the highest sense, true; but we are not certain that we can, by sight, assure ourselves, in each apparent case of discrepancy, that it is so. I have elsewhere maintained, and I maintain again here, that if we could know exactly how any given event related in the Gospels happened, we should at once be able to account for the variations in the narratives, and the separate truth of each would be shown; but, not knowing the exact details of any event thus narrated, nor the position of the narrator with respect to it, we can not undertake to reconcile apparent discrepancies between the Evangelists. Our plain duty, in making a right use of the Gospels, is, firmly and fearlessly to recognize these, and to leave them as fearlessly unsolved, if no honest solution can be found. A way may be opened by and by, in the process of human discovery, and the toil of human thought; or the time for a solution may not come, till the day when all things shall be known.

Let me, then, in pursuance of these remarks, mention what I believe to be the requisites for the right use of the Gospels—indeed, of any portion of Holy Scripture.

And I will mention, first, FAITH. These books of Holy Writ are totally unlike any other books in the world. Ever since they were first published, the best, and purest, and wisest of mankind have regarded them as inspired by God. The greatest change for good ever wrought among our species has been the effect of these books. Wherever they are known, that change is still going on. It is no less than a change from darkness to light, from the power of Satan to God. These books contain depths which the sublimest human intellect can not fathom, beneath a tempting and beautiful surface, which may attract the unlearned and the

child. No imitations have ever come near them; never book spake like this Book. Well, then, in the name of all that is reasonable and consistent, trust this Book! Don't be ever trembling for it; still less, ever caviling at it. It can hold its own. The voice of God does not speak in it any the less, because, to our dull ears, it sometimes seems to send forth an uncertain sound. Let us take a manly line in this matter. This Book is God's Book. It is the great light which He hath put in the firmament of the Church, to rule the day, rejoicing as a giant to run its course, and to flood the earth with its blessed light. But the telescope shows me apparent spots in it. Does it, therefore, cease to be the sun? Shall I, therefore, refuse to walk and work by its light? Shall I not, rather, say, "I know that those interruptions of light are themselves phenomena in the outpouring of the light? He who doeth all things well hath done this well also, though at this moment I may not know how." Say not, unreasonably and untrustingly, "I can not believe this to be the sun; I can not work by its light, unless it can be shown to me that there is not a spot on its bright surface." He who does this throws an immense advantage into the hands of the unbeliever. He puts his faith at the mercy of every caviler; he throws his pearls before swine, who, having trampled them under their feet, will turn again and rend him.

Approach the holy Gospels from the side of trust and love, not from that of distrust and unchristian doubt. In them is found the blessed presence of Him whom, if you are a Christian, your soul loves above all things; of Him through whom you have your daily access to the Father of your spirit; of Him whose atoning blood, daily applied to your soul, is your only confidence before God, in the midst of daily-growing proofs of your own utter unworthiness; of Him whose victory over death is your only hope as years pass on, and the edges of the dark shadow begin to enfold you. You fear as you enter the cloud; but you are reassured, because in it He stands transfigured in light. These Gospels are the history of Him; how He, from his awful Godhead, was pleased to stoop to be born as one of us, and yet not as one of us; how, in the emptying out of his glory as God, there grew up mysteriously around Him, in his humiliation, the elements of human knowledge; how, Himself without sin, He entered into conflict with sinners. How loving

in the midst of severity, how gentle amidst sternness, how humble in the holding back of his power, was ever his bearing among those who hated him! How holy and harmless was his going down into death! how glorious his victory over it!

Take these blessed facts as the life of your soul, and go to the Gospels to know more of them and of Him. When this is the main object, all else will easily fall into its place. He who is ever sitting at the feet of Jesus and learning, will be listening more to his blessed words than to idle voices which float in the air around. He who has his eyes fixed on the Divine form of the Son of God, in his glorified humanity, will have small inclination to "peep and botanize" with the poor paltry caviler. He whose daily sustenance is the bread of God which came down from heaven, and whose inner thirst is daily quenched by draughts of the water of life, will hardly be persuaded by those who tell him that there is no sustenance in the one, nor refreshment in the other. Depend upon it, FAITH is the great primary requisite for the right use of the Gospels.

And, next to faith, INTELLIGENCE. "Be ye not unwise, but understanding what the will of the Lord is." God has given us his Gospels, a revelation from heaven. HE, I say, has given them to us. They have not somehow escaped from His secret place, like a document furtively abstracted by some officious angel, and found their way down into the world no one knows how; but every step of their compilation, promulgation, preservation has been his especial care. Not only what they contain—their substance—but the vehicle in which that substance is delivered, their language and outer phenomena; and not only that, again, but the form in which, even to the minutest detail, their transmission to us has taken place—all these have not been as they are without his will. And those who ignore these, and determine to use the Gospels without taking them at all into account, will of necessity come short of the fullness of their use; will of necessity lie open to the attacks of unbelief; will of necessity be feeble and timorous, or, what is even worse, overbearing and rash in their defense of the faith.

First, then, notice that this holy Gospel which you are reading, and in which you trace the Divine form of your Savior and listen to His voice, is not written in words of light on the sky, one record, indivisible, indisputable. God made use of *four*

instruments—*four* inspired men—to gather the facts and words into histories for you. He did not so inspire those four that they all wrote the same concerning the same thing, or that they all reported the same discourse in the same words. He was pleased that they should each look on the facts from a slightly different point of view, and each retain, or find retained, slightly differing groups of the sayings of the Lord. Now, as we have said, all this has not been accident; is not to be lamented; is not to be passed over. It is so written for our learning. Various reasons, even in our incapacity to fathom the Divine purposes, may be imagined why this should have been done. There might have been one supreme record, and one only; but this might have been perilous for a dispensation and a Church which was to regard not the letter, but the spirit, and to walk not by sight, but by faith.

And another matter is here to be noticed. We know these Gospels by the names of certain writers; but, in the case of three of them, we have no authority whatever for such appropriation in the Gospels themselves, nor in any cotemporary document. Trustworthy tradition alone is our warrant for believing St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke to have written the Gospels which bear their names. In the case of the fourth, it may be gathered, almost with certainty, from the contents of the Gospel itself, who it was that wrote it. But even here the writer's name is nowhere told us; nay, is purposely concealed. So little is there of documentary authentication, so little of the authority or dignity of mere names, about writings on which the faith of the Church is to rest, all the ages of the world. It is the character of the Gospels themselves, not the authority with which they come to us, on which it has pleased God to fix our attention. We are to value them for what they *are*, not for what they say they are. Let, then, *what they are* be our main study—the real character and contents of each, as discovered by intelligent search and discrimination.

But here another consideration meets us. These Gospels, so important to the Church, have not come to us in one undisputed form. We have no authorized copy of them in their original language, so that we may know in what precise words they were originally written. The authorities from which we derive their sacred text are various ancient copies, written by hand on

parchment. Of the Gospels, there are more than *five hundred* of these manuscripts, of various ages, from the fourth century after Christ to the fifteenth, when printing superseded manual writing for publication of books. Of these five hundred and more, no two are, in all points, alike; probably in no two of the more ancient can even a few consecutive verses be found in which all the words agree. Most of the differences are unimportant to the meaning; but, on the other hand, some are very important, even to the omission in some copies, and insertion in others, of passages of considerable length. Obviously, of all these manuscripts, those which are the most ancient are the most valuable. And we can tell which are the most ancient by knowing what *manner of writing* prevailed at different times. We have of the Gospels two manuscripts, containing them nearly entire, which belong to the *fourth* century; one, besides many fragments of others, written in the *fifth* century; another, and that a very remarkable one, which apparently dates from the *sixth*. In these very ancient documents, the forms of the sacred text are sometimes widely divergent. Nay, a remakable phenomenon is forcing itself on the minds of those who have been widely conversant with these oldest authorities; namely, that the further back we go, the more divergent in mere outward form become the wordings of the same passages which are narrated by the Gospels in common, and, also, the more divergent in the different primitive manuscripts become the mere words of the sacred text throughout. The truth appears to have been that, in those early days, as is also clearly shown by the quotations of Scripture in the works of the Fathers, men cared little for the precise words provided the sense were correctly given. "What matters it," says St. Augustine, in commenting on the cry, "Save, Lord: we perish"—the words and the time of utterance of which are variously reported by the Evangelists—"what matters it whether the disciples, in calling on the Lord, really used one or another of these expressions, or some other, differing from them all, but still giving the sense that they were perishing, and called on Him to save them?" Here is a noble example of one who made right use of, and could trust, the Gospels. Strive to imitate this. Be intelligent enough to recognize, and intelligent enough not to be afraid of, these differences of Gospel from Gospel, and of various forms of the same

passage in the same Gospel. Not the form, but the substance, is to save thy soul; for the kingdom of God is not in word, but in power.

Another point of importance, which, in a proper use of the Gospels, an ordinary Christian reader must not fail to discern, is, that he possesses them, not in their original tongue, but in a translation made from that tongue into his own. This, likewise, is God's will respecting him, and it is not for him to ignore it by acting as if it were otherwise. It is no accident that the English reader is compelled to use the Scriptures in a form in which man, and not God, has written them. He who has made of one blood all nations on the earth, and has fixed their times and the bounds of their habitation, so arranged the issues of things that the revelation of Himself by Christ should be originally written in the most wonderful and powerful of human tongues. The Greek language possesses capacities for expressing minute differences, and for fathoming profound depths, of thought, of which our own tongue is destitute. In rendering from one into the other, very much must be sacrificed—very much of fullness of meaning, of variety of possible senses, of power to attract and to convince. This would be the case even were the translation faultlessly accurate, and made by infallible authority. But I need not say that no translation has ever possessed these qualities. The English version, for faithfulness, for simplicity, for majesty, will bear comparison with any that ever has been made; yet it is not a word more than the truth to say that it abounds with errors and inadequate renderings.

In this matter let me speak plainly, and say that the Church of Christ in this land has not acted faithfully by her members. A formidable list of passages might be given, in which our version either has confessedly misrendered the original, or has followed a form of the text now well known not to have been the original form. These might be corrected at any time; and it is a grievous thing that this has not been done, or is not now in doing; for, as matters now stand, we are printing for reading in our churches, we are sending forth into the cottage and the mansion, books containing passages and phrases which pretend to be the Word of God, and are not—and that, when the remedy is most easy, and lies, at any time, in our power. Let a commission of men learned in the Scriptures be appointed, chosen

from among our different Christian denominations, with definite powers as to this weighty matter, to be exercised under proper safeguards; and in a few years, at most, this stumbling-block will have been removed. The time may not have been ripe for it a short while ago, but I believe it is ripe for it now, at least as far as regards the New Testament. And mind, I speak not as a youthful enthusiast, but as one whose life, now not a short one, has been mainly spent in the study of the Sacred Word; not as a lover of change in this matter, but as an ardent admirer and lover of the dear old English words of our national Bible. Let us not lose one well-known text in that our precious inheritance, unless it be, in the estimation of all who are capable of judging, a right hand which ought to be cut off, an eye which must be plucked out. But the state of things at present is most unsatisfactory. As a nation, and as Churches, are we making a right use of the Holy Gospels, or of the rest of God's revealed Word, till these blemishes are removed?

What, then, ought to be, on the mind of the English reader, the effect of this last treated fact—the necessary imperfection of the particular vehicle in which God's providence has transmitted the Gospels to him? Not distrust; not unbelief. Were his version tenfold more imperfect than it is, there would be no excuse for either of these. The glories of the everlasting Gospel, as seen in Him who is its subject, are not blotted out for him. The treasure within is not less precious for a few, comparatively, insignificant flaws in the earthen vessel containing it. Dig thou ever in this thy field for the treasure passing all price, even Christ the hope of glory. The soil may yet be rough—some stones remaining to turn the edge of thy tool, some clods unbroken which pass thy strength to cleave asunder—but for all these, thou shalt find, if thou seekest aright. Only go not about boasting vainly of thy possession of this holy Book, without, in fact, really possessing it at all; for only he can be said, in any worthy sense, to *possess* it who knows what the will of God has been toward him in it, and by it, both as to its inner contents, and as to its outward form and transmission to himself.

In concluding these general preliminary observations, I would yet mention *two* requisites for the right use of the Gospels. The former of these is Honesty—a straightforward, manly

spirit, afraid of no truth, disclaiming all compromise with falsehood. Whatever certain apologists for their defection from the truth may say, there is, depend upon it, *no just cause* which can excuse a lie. Nay, the better the cause, the worse the falsehood, because it betrays the more distrust of Him who will suffer no good thing to fail. And some, shame to say, have endeavored to save the credit of the Holy Gospels, by concealing, by palliating, by solving inadequately and unfaithfully, these difficulties and these drawbacks of which we have been treating. Do thou, my reader, who wishest to live in the light of God and by the example of Christ, not consent unto these persons. Handle not the Word of God deceitfully. Every fact respecting it is God's fact, sent by God to thee for thy good. Fear it not; face it, and give it its due influence. It may seem unwelcome at first—a visitor whose aspect and speech jar on thy snug system of cherished home-thoughts—but, depend upon it, thou wilt have entertained an angel unawares. Only be sure that it is genuine, and not an idle fiction of the enemy; for in our days the enemy is very busy. Men who ought to know better are striving to overthrow the faith of the Church, by approaching the Scriptures from a hostile point of view, and caviling at statements in them which the most ordinary common sense seems to explain satisfactorily. Be not, on the other hand, deceived by these fair-seeming writers. Do not let them quietly assume, as they do, all the credit for honesty, and brand us believers with disingenuousness. Show them that we are as truthful as they are; show them that there is, at least, as much honesty and manliness in a hearty defense of the faith as in their boastful abandonment of it. Give not the unbeliever a monopoly of fair-dealing. Be true, while you believe; and pray that he, too, may be, some day, convinced that the only way to be true is to believe.

And the other requisite is CHARITY. In fact, the one requisite above all others. Oh, my brothers, we all speak and write too many hard, bitter words; we all indulge in too many cruel sentences; we are all trying to break, not to mend, the bruised reed. In this matter of the Holy Gospels, especially, do we need the blessed gift of charity. *They* are not Christ, but were given to lead to Christ. And if any seem to have laid hold on Christ by their means, blessed is that man, whether

he know little or much, whether he be aware of any thing else respecting them or not. Let this ever be borne in mind by us. While we are striving to be strong in the faith, let us not despise the faith of the weakest; for there will come a day to us all when, in the giving way of the powers of nature, and the pouring in of the great water-floods, we shall grasp at something which may hold us up and carry us over. And then, not how much we have searched out and known, not how much we have disputed and prevailed, will help us, but how much we have lived on Christ, and heard in our souls of his own life-giving voice, and how much we have shown in the world of his meek and lowly example.

For this, use the Gospels; for this, search into them and appreciate them—not to argue and dispute out of, not to become vain and puffed-up by, but to grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

The position that science and religion may be, and ought to be, kept entirely separate, . . is a doctrine offering many temptations to many minds. It is grateful to scientific men who deprecate being thought hostile to religion. It is grateful to religious men who are afraid of being thought to be afraid of science. . . There is but one objection to it—but that is the fatal objection—that it is not true. The spiritual world and the intellectual world are not separated after this fashion; and the notion that they are so separated does but encourage men to accept in each ideas which will, at last, be found to be untrue in both. The instinct which impels us to seek for harmony in the truths of science and the truths of religion, is a higher instinct and a truer one than the disposition which leads us to evade the difficulty by pretending that there is no relation between them. For, after all, it is a pretense, and nothing more. .. We may believe, and we must believe, many things which we can not understand; but we can not really believe two propositions which are felt to be contradictory. It helps us nothing, in such a difficulty, to say that the one proposition belongs to reason, and the other proposition belongs to faith. The endeavor to reconcile them is a necessity of the mind. We are right in thinking that if they are both indeed true, they can be reconciled, and if they really are fundamentally opposed, they can not both be true.—*The Duke of Argyll, in "Good Words."*

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH AND SOCIAL IMPROVEMENT.*

Our age is certainly not an age of monasticism. No religious teacher of any mark now teaches, either directly or implicitly, that to serve Christ faithfully, men must literally go out of the world. The current of religious teachings runs rather in the opposite direction. Christians are constantly urged to carry their religion into the world. They are to impregnate all lawful secular pursuits with the spirit of Christ. No formal boundary is to be drawn in practice, at least, between things secular and things sacred. The most secular pursuits are to acquire a tinge of sacredness from the spirit in which they are carried on, and the objects to which they are directed. Christianity is to be viewed as the friendly ally of literature, science, the fine arts, and, indeed, all legitimate modes of culture and development, as designed to mingle with them, and to stamp them with her image and superscription. Without her impress, indeed, they are not to be held as current coin or legitimate wares—they have a contraband character, which only her mark can remove.

It is one thing, however, to establish the position that Christianity has a very close relation to secular things, and another thing to show in what manner the alliance between them is to be practically carried out. The position that the spirit of Christianity ought to rule in all secular affairs, might by some be regarded as justifying the inference that the dominion of the Church should be paramount to all other dominion. As every secular question has, or ought to have, a religious element involved in it; as that element ought to have a ruling influence; and as it is the business of the Church to look after that element, and to see that it has its proper place assigned to it, the Church might have some reason for demanding a universal controlling or superintending function; and so, at a bound, the dreams of Hildebrand would be realized. By this kind of logic, the government of the Papal States would become the model for the Christian world, and the problem of the right relation of the secular to the spiritual would be solved by the uncontrolled subjection of the one to the other.

---

* From the *British and Foreign Evangelical Review*, October, 1864.

It is evident that this question can not be settled in so summary a way. But, leaving abstractions, let us take up the particular case of the relation of the Church to social questions. On this subject there is an extreme position held by a very few persons, which it were a work of supererogation to combat. It is that the Christian Church has nothing to do with social questions, or with social science in any shape. Christ s kingdom is not of this world; it is a spiritual kingdom, dealing with the souls of men; and any contact with what in its own nature is secular, is foreign to its objects, and hurtful to its spirituality. It is needless to waste powder and shot on a man of straw. If any one were so foolish as to speak thus, the best way of answering him would be to get him to spend a day in visiting some dark "land" or lane, in company with a city missionary or territorial minister. Before midday, we should undertake that he would be beginning to alter his tone. By afternoon, he would be deeply impressed with the desirableness of better houses, better air, better food, better modes of buying and selling, better ways of making provision for sickness and old age, in order to give the Word of God "free course" among such a people. Ere his labors for the day closed, we are persuaded, he would feel that the Christian Church dare not act the part of the priest and the Levite, in regard to the social evils that overlay the masses; she not only may but must use her influence, in some way, to remedy evils so terrible in themselves, and so prejudicial to the progress and prosperity of the Gospel.

But we are not to rush from one extreme to the opposite. There are persons who, when once they have demolished the position that the Christian Church has nothing to do with social questions, conceive that the entire field of social improvement lies before her, and that it is lawful for her, and even incumbent on her, to set to work to reform society at every point. At least, wherever a social question is seen to have a bearing on religious interests and duties, it is conceived that it is the Church's duty to address herself to that question. In our humble judgment, the line within which the authorities of the Church are entitled, or are bound to act, requires to be drawn with a much more discriminating hand. The authorities of the Christian Church require to be careful how they interfere with matters that do not lie strictly within their special domain. The world is jealous of such interference, and is even more jealous in the case of eccle-

siastical bodies than of any other. By rashly or hastily intermeddling with such things, the Christian Church might come to lose her legitimate influence in regard to them. By going beyond her proper line, or even by acting inexpediently within her own line, she might meet with opposition and even reproach; she might be requested, by those in possession of the field, to leave them alone to manage their affairs, and told, in language more plain than pleasant, to mind her own proper business.

For guidance as to the course to be pursued by her in reference to questions bearing on the arrangements of society, the Church must, of course, in the first instance, have recourse to the Word of God. We propose to commence our article by inquiring what light is thrown on the subject, first, by the Old Testament, and then by the New. We shall find that, at first sight, their instructions seem to run in rather opposite lines; but, on more careful consideration, we shall see that in spirit, at all events, they are substantially the same.

Open the Old Testament, we find the arrangements of society not only occupying a prominent place in the law of Moses, but prescribed with all that exactness and minuteness of detail which is so conspicuous in all departments of the old economy. The social system of the Hebrews was a peculiar one, very specially adapted to the peculiar position the Hebrews had to fill, and the purpose they had to serve. It was preëminently a local system, squared to the land of Palestine, and incapable, except in some of its general principles, of being carried out anywhere else. It was based upon the division of the whole soil of Palestine among eleven of the tribes, a separate maintenance being provided for the Levites. Though properties could be pledged or pawned for a time to others, they never could be alienated, as the jubilee, or fiftieth year, constantly restored them to the families of the original owners. Any disputes that might arise as to the rights of ownership were promptly settled by means of a system of registration, which showed at once the name and the family of the rightful owner. The laws relating to theft were framed on the basis of this system of all but universally-spread property. The whole social arrangements of the community, indeed, rested on this foundation, and were connected with Jerusalem, as their great center of influence and regulation. The consequence was, that the social system of the Jews, as a system, was incapable of

transplantation. It could not have been set up by the rivers of Babylon, even had the conqueror allowed it; it could not have been introduced at Alexandria or Antioch, notwithstanding the special favor which Alexander the Great, and some of his successors, had for the Jews. As a system, it was purely local, and, therefore, essentially temporary. There is no obligation now, therefore, to construct society on the Hebrew basis; and for whatever purpose that system may be available, it is not as a pattern for close imitation. There is much to be gathered from its general spirit, and there are many hints to be derived from its specific details. Dispersed throughout many lands, the Jews, in proportion as they carried its spirit along with them, reached a corresponding degree of social prosperity, and were commonly esteemed as better citizens and better subjects than the members of any other nationality. Even down to the present day, the Hebrew community shows itself, amid all the disadvantages under which it labors, to be possessed of a wonderful capacity to keep itself from that terrible social misery that seems every-where else to dog the advancing steps of wealth and civilization. Beggary, except in the case of those diseased and maimed, hardly exists in Hebrew communities; and even in such a city as London, the measures taken to find out and relieve the needy, and keep them from sinking into the gulf of mendicancy, are such as to afford lessons of no common value even to the most active and benevolent Christians.*

The truth is, that most of what is of binding obligation, and of universal and perpetual use in the social institutions of Moses, is imbodied for us in one of the sacred books that, strangely enough, was more popular in the age of our fathers than it is in ours—the Proverbs of Solomon. The Proverbs bear a very marked and most interesting relation to the Pentateuch. They are manifestly the offspring of the system inaugurated there, but an offspring which it must have taken a good many generations to mature and perfect. Every Biblical scholar knows that though the whole book bears the name of Solomon, it is by no means to be regarded as the product of Solomon's wisdom alone. Certain parts of it are expressly stated to have been

---

* See articles on the Jewish Charities in London in *Christian Work*, for June, 1864.

written by others. Part of it, no doubt, was Solomon's; but of other parts he was only the compiler, or editor, reducing to form and order—under Divine guidance—the floating proverbial wisdom that had been accumulating for generations before his time. Among other things that thoughtful and godly men in the Hebrew state had been accustomed to observe, to speak of to their friends and neighbors, and to hand down to their children, were the general laws and conditions of social prosperity. The Book of Proverbs is full of maxims of social wisdom, expressed in the pithy proverbial form, giving the result of much careful observation and shrewd pondering over the actual facts of Hebrew history from the age of Moses downward. Deposits of this kind are of slow formation. The existence of such a proverbial philosophy, therefore, necessarily indicates the lapse of lengthened periods of time, and is a strong argument for proving that the Pentateuch is far older than the age of Solomon. The Pentateuch is almost wholly a system of legislation *ab extra*, and necessarily belongs to an early period of a nation's life—before it has acquired the self-governing faculty. The Proverbs belong to a higher and more advanced stage of a nation's life, when its positive institutions have been digested, so to speak, by thoughtful men; when the principles underlying them have been apprehended, and when these principles are given out in the form of maxims or proverbs, constituting a legislation, *ab extra*, that immensely magnifies the practical influence of the system. The Book of Proverbs is a sort of focus, in which are concentrated the scattered wisdom of all Hebrew times and places, from the days of the great legislator to those of the most influential and wide-reigning of Hebrew kings. Gathered into a focus from the sphere of all previous times, these rays of wisdom were again sent forth for the guidance of the whole world—like the seed of a tree which, having sucked up all the nourishment of its own little garden, proceed to impart its ripened treasures far and near on every side.

When we examine the contents of the Book of Proverbs in their bearing on the welfare of society, we find that, for the most part, they consist of counsels addressed to individuals, inculcating the social virtues, but not going much into the detailed arrangements of social economy. For example, the writers are never weary of the praise of industry. In every form, direct

and indirect, the hand and the habits of the diligent are honored. Slothfulness and irregular ways, let them be redeemed by what qualities they may, have no chance of toleration. Wastefulness and negligence are without excuse. The garden of the sluggard is a proverb and a by-word. The sensual vices are the highway to ruin. No sharp line is drawn, no line of any kind, between the moral and the social elements of prosperity. On the contrary, the social rests on the moral as its foundation, and so impregnated by it throughout. The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, social as well as personal. The edifice of society, if made to rest on any other basis, rests on a foundation of sand. Wisdom, in the highest sense, must pervade the whole economy: "Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is the reproach of any people."

No one can fail to observe how much the *domestic* element preponderates in the Proverbs. The familiar and affectionate address to "my son," gives us constantly the idea of a domestic scene. "The house," too, is seldom absent from our view. "Wisdom hath builded her house." "The house of the righteous shall stand, but the house of the wicked shall be overthrown." The domestic relations are perpetually introduced. "Hear the instruction of thy father, and forsake not the law of thy mother," is the chorus, so to speak, of the whole song. The prominence of woman, too, in a book of oriental origin, is remarkable. All throughout, we see how "every wise woman buildeth her house;" the book ends, and in a manner culminates with the account of the model housewife, the "virtuous woman;" and as we close it, the last note of Divine wisdom that rings in our ear is this: "A woman that feareth the Lord, she shall be praised."

If, then, we bear in mind that in the Proverbs we have the permanent essence, as it were, of the social provisions of the law of Moses (as well as of other of its provisions), stored up for all times and for all places, we shall necessarily infer that the chief and primary duty (we do not say the *only* duty) of the Church, in endeavoring to promote the welfare of society, is to inculcate and cherish the great social virtues. A preacher who shall take the Book of Proverbs as his text-book, in dealing with such subjects, will find himself continually called to insist, first of all, on religion, or the fear of God as the true basis of social prosperity;

and, second, but only second to this, to commend the domestic constitution, firmly established and faithfully carried out. The virtues of frugality, diligence, punctuality, truthfulness, honesty, neighborliness, good temper, and the like, will, ever and anon, come in for a share of his attention; and, in enforcing and illustrating these, he will come into contact, more or less close, according to his turn of mind, with the secular affairs and interests of his people. It can not be said to be optional whether or not the faithful minister of the Word shall handle such topics. He is bound to set before his people "the whole counsel of God," and not to move merely in the somewhat limited circle which is denoted exclusively by what some people term "the Gospel." We, of course, bear in mind that there is such a thing as proportion and relative importance in the several truths that constitute the revealed will of God. We are very far from saying that the matters we are now dealing with ought to have the first place; we only affirm that they ought to have some place. We are very certain that the arrangements of social life would in practice be far more satisfactory, in orthodox communities, if the principles and precepts that are applied to them in the Book of Proverbs were more frequently expounded and enforced from the pulpit.

When we pass from the Old Testament to the New, we find nothing whatever corresponding to the minute and elaborate social provisions of the law of Moses. Not only is there no shadow of a purpose to establish a particular system of social economy, but, what at first appears startling, there is not even a protest against the gross social corruptions and abuses of the time. The fabric of pagan society is well known to have been extremely corrupt. The great mass of the laboring classes were kept in a disgraceful state of slavery, and the style of public amusements universally in vogue was exceedingly objectionable. Yet, not a single shaft is openly leveled, either by our Lord or his disciples, against these social corruptions. They seem to have preserved an intentional silence upon them, as if they felt it must not be by battering-rams and catapults that the walls of pagan Jericho were to fall, and that the ark of God carried unwearicdly round it, and the sound of the trumpet of the everlasting Gospel, would prove mightier instruments than any carnal weapons for the falling down of these strongholds, and the erection of a Christian fabric in their room.

No enemy, even, will allege that want of courage could have been the reason why our Lord and his Apostles did not point their artillery against the social corruptions of the day. There was no lack of courage shown by either the one or the other in dealing with the religious abuses that were prevalent. The notions and practices of the "scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites," were assailed by our Lord with a courage which was equaled only by his vehemence. The men whose boldness astonished the chief priests, as they fearlessly flung against them the charge of murdering the Lord of glory, would have been quite prepared to bring equally bold charges against the pagan rulers of the country or of the world, had faithfulness to the interests committed to them required them to do so.

But this was not demanded of them. It was through the influence of the *spirit*, rather than the *letter*, that Christianity was designed to operate in subverting the social institutions of paganism. It was not with the swords and staves, but with the breath of its mouth, that it was to fight against such things. In dealing with them, it was to exemplify "the expulsive power of a new affection;" "perfect love" was to cast out fear, and the works of darkness were to be dispossessed by the armor of light.

In judging of the course followed by the early Church in this matter, in its bearing on the duty of the Church now, we must bear in mind that there is a vast difference between the duty of a Church struggling for existence in the face of a bitterly hostile community, and the duty of a Church which includes, or at least represents, the great mass of a community. In the one case, the great object of the Church is to *root* itself; in the other, it is to *develop* itself. In no circumstances, of course, may a Church be guilty of any compromise of truth, or of any sanction of evil. But a Church striving to root itself, is not bound at once to denounce every evil it finds in a community, any more than a Christian man, aiming at the conversion of an unbeliever, is bound at once to denounce every evil practice, great and small, of which he may be guilty. It was on this principle that our Lord and his Apostles acted, in planting the tree of life in heathen soils. They aimed, first of all, at getting it to strike its roots freely into the soil. Once it was fairly and firmly planted, it would not only bear its twelve

manner of fruits, but spread out its leaves for the healing of the nations. In its full development, it would come to bear on many a practice against which it was not requisite, at first, for them to declare open war.

If the early preachers had openly assailed all the objectionable social arrangements of their time, they would have laid themselves open to the charge of being revolutionists in politics, and thus have furnished a plausible ground for proceedings on the part of the civil authorities against them. It might have been maintained, with a fair show of reason, that they were interfering with the province of Cæsar, and were, therefore, justly amenable to Cæsar's discipline and to Cæsar's rebuke. Even as the case stood, we perceive, on all occasions, how earnestly the enemies of the Christians endeavored to make out that they were guilty of offenses against the civil law. The careful and blameless course pursued by the Christians caused all such charges to recoil, and nothing could hide or obscure the fact that the doctrine of salvation was what they were striving, with all their might, to establish; that what they clung to so tenaciously themselves, and were so eager that others also should cling to, was, that "God hath given to us eternal life, and that this life is in His Son." Had it been otherwise; had they been arraigned and punished for interfering with the arrangements of society, even in matters where the pagans were wrong and the Christians right; had the conflict between them and their opponents turned upon any such subordinate points; had it turned upon any thing except the great question whether Jesus Christ was the Son of God and the Savior of the world, no one can fail to see how greatly the glory of the conflict would have been dimmed, and the influence of their testimony impaired.

The course which the early Christians followed had this further advantage, that it led them to rely on the genuine spirit of Christianity, as the chief means of superseding the corrupt institutions of paganism, and placing society on a Christian basis. It would have been a good thing, they may have thought, if they could have induced the civil ruler to enact laws against many of the abuses and abominations that prevailed around them; but certainly they had no such power. What, then, were they to do? They had but one weapon left to them, but happily it was best of

all. They could try to foster every-where the spirit of Christian love and Christ-like purity. If they could but succeed in that, the battle would be gained. By law, Onesimus was, no doubt, the slave of Philemon. It was not a right law, but they could not change it, and it would have destroyed their cause, struggling as they were for existence, if they had then even agitated for a change. But the love of Christ has taken possession of Onesimus's heart, and Philemon has become his brother in Christ. Onesimus must be urged to cherish to Philemon all the brotherly love and regard that are due from one Christian to another. By and by all the Onesimuses in the Church will begin to see that slavery and Christianity can not go hand in hand together. They will see that in Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free, but all are one. They will see the sin of holding in bondage one whom Christ has made free, or of calling him a slave whom Christ has called a brother, and of whom Christ has said, "Inasmuch as ye have done it to the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." If the state should ever become Christian, if its ruling powers or ruling influences should ever be in harmony with the will of Christ, they will not suffer such an institution to linger for a day—slavery will be numbered with the things that were.

Of course, the position of the Christian Church is very much changed now, and that reserve in dealing with social corruptions which it was necessary to maintain, in the face of a pagan, jealous, persecuting government, is, by no means, so necessary now. The Church is less called to root herself than to develop herself, and that duty brings her into close contact with the social practices of the day. But, notwithstanding this change, it is very plain from what we have now seen to be characteristic of the teaching of the New Testament on the subject, that the Church would be guilty of a grievous blunder if she did not rely *mainly* on the same great weapon for promoting the welfare of society, on which their circumstances compelled the early Church to rely exclusively. The Spirit of Christ must ever be the great agent in effecting social reformation. It is only as men are taught and induced to renounce sin and selfishness, to fear God and to love one another, that society will become really better. The old spirit of the first murderer—"Am I my brother's keeper?"—must be driven out by the spirit that teaches us to "look not every

man on his own things, but every man, also, on the things of others." The Church must not only teach these things, but practice them, too. The prominent men in the Christian Church, clerical and lay, who give her a tone and character before the world, must be conspicuous for this spirit. Pulpits must ring with representations of its value, and the voice of prayer must confess, with sorrow, its absence or its feebleness, and supplicate it as one of the richest blessings of heaven. Without this, any noisy agitation for social improvements on the part of the Church, or on the part of churchmen, or any fussy assumption of the functions of the tribunes of the people, will utterly fail. The only credit the Church will get, will be the credit of intermeddling with the business of others; and the final result will be that, in place of extending her influence in the secular region, she will weaken it in the spiritual.

But let us suppose that the Christian Church is duly impressed with the duty of relying, in the main, on the culture of a good Christian spirit as the great instrument of social amelioration, the question fairly arises, Is it incumbent on the Church, in the circumstances in which she is now placed, to confine herself to the use of that instrument? Is it never her duty to protest against specific social evils, or to use her influence, directly and earnestly, with the civil rulers of a country to get these evils removed, to get arrangements established more in harmony with the spirit of Christianity, and more conducive to the welfare of a Christian people?

Two states of things may present themselves, in which the consideration of this question becomes a matter of high practical interest. The first is the case of a country where Christianity is the recognized religion, and the authority of the Word of God all but universally acknowledged. The second is the case of a barbarous community, such as the whole of the South Sea Islands, a few years ago, and many of them still, where missionaries are striving to plant the banner of Christ, and at once Christianize and civilize the people.

We will treat the two cases separately. We begin with the case of the Christian nation, where social arrangements exist, that are either opposed to the spirit of Christianity, or very hurtful to the prosperity of Christians. What is the duty of the Christian Church in reference to these?

We have said that in a heathen country the immediate duty of the Church is to root herself, but in a Christian country it is to develop herself. The lessons of Christianity are, evidently, to have a much wider range in the latter case than they can in the former. The work of legislation, for example, is now to be conducted on Christian principles; and not merely the formal legislation of parliaments or senates, but the legislation of social custom, the legislation of commercial practice, the whole legislation of use and want. When the legislators profess to obey Christ, the Church must urge them to the performance of the will of Christ in their whole sphere of activity. *Whatsoever* they do, they must do all to the glory of God. Now it is that it must be seen that "the leaves of the tree are for the healing of the nations." The Gospel of Jesus Christ must now be shown to be the panacea for all the evils, personal, social, and national, that have come into the world through sin. This development of the spirit of Christianity will, necessarily, lead the Church to examine social questions much more carefully. Can any rules or principles be laid down to guide her in this important but delicate work?

In the first place, it is obviously the duty of the Church, in the circumstances supposed—and here we mean by the Church, chiefly, the persons or the courts that direct her policy and utter her voice—to take care that gross violations of right are not allowed to shelter themselves under the euphemism of social or political arrangements. Perhaps this is her duty in all circumstances; certainly it is her duty when the whole nation professes to regard her teaching. The leaders of the Church must not forget their bounden duty. "Cry aloud, spare not, lift up thy voice like a trumpet, and show my people their transgressions, and the house of Jacob their sins." It has been common enough to endeavor to divest certain things of the odious character of sins, by representing them as but branches of the civil constitution of a country. Such was preëminently the case, at one time, with regard to the "peculiar institution" of America. Churches excused themselves from protesting against it, or taking any step adverse to it, on the ground that it was part and parcel of the civil constitution, with which the Church was not called or allowed to meddle. That the plea was a hollow and unworthy one, is easily shown. If it were admissible, it might be made to cover any iniquity that happened to be incorporated with the govern-

ment of a community. No healthy and unsophisticated conscience could dream, for a moment, that the circumstances of its being intimately blended with the civil arrangements could divest of moral guilt a system which sanctioned the buying and selling of human beings as goods or chattels, which disregarded the sanctity of marriage, ruthlessly invaded the unity of families, withdrew from a whole race the protection of the laws, and made the cultivation of their intellect a crime liable to be severely punished. But the untenableness of the position of the American Churches, now referred to, is seen, further, from the fact that erelong it was practically abandoned. Of late years, the Christian Churches of the South, it is notorious, have changed their ground. Slavery is not now an evil which they are to be excused from attacking on the ground of its being a civil institution; it is the right and normal state of things. It is the blessed institution, handed down from patriarchal times, which Divine wisdom has devised and eminently blessed for the welfare of the inferior race. Under it the negro has renounced his barbarous life and his barbarous tongue, has been taught to worship the living God, and commit his soul to the grace of the Savior. Under it he has been restrained from those excesses into which his own wild will would have been forever dragging him, and has enjoyed a life, not, indeed, without its drawbacks, but in which the good to him has vastly outweighed the evil. This change of argument is a bold, and we must say unhallowed, attempt to substitute a more glittering euphemism for a more ordinary one. The old cloak having gone to rags, the sin of slavery must be covered by another, snatched this time from the sanctuary of God. The system which could not be attacked because it was a thing civil and secular, is now maintained and defended because it is holy and divine. With what terrible things in righteousness God has been showing his displeasure at the past attitude of America toward slavery, needs not to be dwelt on here. When the Christian people of that country awake from their deep sleep, it will be terrible for them to think what untold miseries and calamities might have been averted, if they had but set their faces against these wretched euphemisms, and denounced the slave system of their country as a heinous crime against man and against God.

So, also, the Churches must take care that similar sins, com-

mitted in *commercial* circles, are not allowed to escape on the plea that they belong to the usages of trade. The notion that their connection with trade exempts them from the rigid operation of the moral law, must be dealt with very unmercifully. It is said of a German bishop, addicted to profane swearing, who was also a prince, that he excused his habit on the ground that he swore as a prince, and not as a bishop. "But if the devil seize the prince on the day of judgment," said an honest attendant, "what will become of the bishop?" The same retort might be made on all who deal with the moral law in their capacity of traders, in a way in which they would not dare to deal with it in the other employments of life. The supremacy of God's revealed will must be maintained throughout the whole sphere of man's lawful avocations. It were an insult to God to suppose that the law which he has given men for the regulation of their conduct is so deficient, so ill-constructed, as to be inapplicable to one large share of human pursuits. Immense progress would be secured in the purification of social life, and the advancement of true Christian civilization, by the firm establishment of the principle that the law of God must be paramount in every pursuit. And it is not merely the stern principles of truth and integrity that must be made to preside over business; many of the gentler Christian virtues, likewise, must be exercised in that sphere. There is a sense in which it is true that business is business, and charity is charity; but business is not to be so separated from practical Christianity that it shall be conducted quite apart from the loving spirit of Christ. Business is a sphere expressly designed for the exercise and pursuit of Christian graces under difficulties. Its worry and turmoil afford the opportunity for the exercise of patience and self-restraint; its dealings with money should stimulate the conscience to very careful stewardship; its uncertainties and perplexities should lead to much prayer for guidance, and for the spirit of trustful reliance on Providence; its constant intercourse with other men should promote the spirit of courtesy, forbearance, truthfulness, and generosity. In adverting to these matters in the present connection, we do not, of course, mean that, even when struggling for existence, the Christian Church can lawfully waive the enforcement upon her own members of such a line of duty as this. What we have in view in bringing this forward in

connection with the duty of a settled Church, in a country professedly Christian, is, that in that case the Church is in a better position to assail prevailing corruptions, and to expose the hollowness of the pretext that their connection with the usages of trade exempts them from deserved condemnation. In a country professedly Christian, she has a great advantage in denouncing them as not only wrong in themselves, but specially wicked in persons who profess to be subjects to the law, and to be actuated by the spirit of Christ. In such circumstances, it is her special duty not merely to expose abuses and corruptions that lie on the surface, and are flagrant and palpable, but to bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and tear conventional excuses from practices that, seen in their true light, are both wicked and shameful.

The Christian Church, however, as society advances, must find herself face to face with social questions of a different kind from those which we have now been considering. There are many social arrangements that are not so wicked in themselves as hurtful in their bearing on the interests of religion and morals. The subject of houses for the working classes, both in town and country, falls under this category. So does the question of having markets and fairs. Popular recreations, too, bear very closely on vital religious interests. So, also, do the regulations under which the sale of intoxicating drink is carried on. The subject of imigration, too, in some of its aspects, is bound up with religious interests; and it raises some very difficult questions, of a purely secular nature, as to the adaptation of certain districts for arable or for pastoral purposes, or the advantages or disadvantages of crops and small holdings. The list of such questions might be greatly extended. What, then, is the duty of a Christian Church in reference to these?

We have pondered much and long over this subject, and we fear the conclusion we have come to must be regarded by some as rather lame and impotent. We do not see that any absolute rule can be laid down on the subject applicable to all cases; in fact, in every case, large use must be made of Christian expediency. A course may be very proper in the particular circumstances of one case that would be very much the reverse in another. The questions that must be settled by considerations of Christian expediency are such as these: Is the bearing of

the social arrangements in question on religious interests so close and so great, as to require the Church, as such, to go a step beyond what is admitted to be her peculiar province in dealing with them? Is the Church in a position to be so thoroughly informed respecting them, that her judgment will carry weight and influence? Or is it likely that she will get entangled in a labyrinth of secular details, and that she will be withdrawn from her own great and peculiar function as an instrument of spiritual and saving good? Are these questions so neglected by other bodies, or are they handled in so defective and unchristian a spirit as to demand that the Church, not only by her voice, declare the principles on which they should be settled, but take the practical execution of them into her own hands?

It is impossible to lay down absolute rules for questions in regard to which the circumstances may be so various; yet there are some general considerations that it will always be well to keep in view.

Thus, in the first place, it would be unbecoming in the Church to show a desire to plunge into the *mare magnum* of social questions: she should restrict herself to a few of those whose bearing on the interests of religion is close, obvious, acknowledged. By the Church here, we mean, of course, the Church in her collective capacity and responsibility; for the remark is not applicable to individual members. There may be in a community great prevailing sins, occupying the public attention to a large degree, and demanding the most careful scrutiny as to their special causes and the proper remedies. In the view of the Church, these evils may be, in a great measure, due to defective or hurtful social arrangements. In Scotland, for example, illegitimacy is a glaring sin. It is not so prevalent, indeed, in Scotland as it is in England, as the Registrar-General has recently shown; but more attention is drawn to it. No one, in these circumstances, could accuse any section of the Christian Church in Scotland of intermeddling, if it should call attention to social arrangements that are believed by it to be a cause of this state of things, and demand, on the part of those who have the power and the responsibility, a remedy for evils of so disastrous a tendency.

Again, it seems obvious that Churches, as such, should not go much into secular details in propounding or discussing remedies

for bad social arrangements. When they get into secular details, they are obviously out of their sphere. In strict logic, no doubt, it may be correct to say, that if it be their duty to take up a secular question at all, it is their duty to discuss it thoroughly. But strict logic must often submit to a curb. The very instinct of the world recoils from the spectacle of a Christian Church court absorbed in secular discussions. And, on the whole, instinct is correct. The courts of the Christian Church claim to meet under the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ, and to act in his name in matters over which he has given them special control. The claim of the Church to exclusive spiritual jurisdiction could not be maintained, if Church courts were to take up all manner of secular questions. It is essential to the concession of the Church's freedom in things spiritual, that she interfere as little as possible with things secular.

This view of the duty of Church courts, it should be observed, does not in the least prevent individual ministers or members from taking part elsewhere in the discussions of any social question in which they may feel an interest. On the contrary, it is just the fact that this liberty remains to them, in their individual capacity, which reconciles us to the conclusion that in their details the discussion of these subjects, within what is technically the Church, should not be encouraged. We would have clergymen, and leading Christian laymen, to throw their energies more than they do into societies that devote themselves to these questions. We would have them bring the influence of their position to bear on such societies more than they do. We would have them go there, and tell how their efforts to do good among the people are often checked and thwarted by the social conditions under which they live. Such a course would do good to themselves, and it would benefit the cause of social improvement. It is of great consequence for clergymen to be seen to possess sympathies that extend far beyond the limits of their denomination, that contemplate the good of society at large, and that lead them to rejoice in whatever good is done, even though it may bring no honor or glory to their own denomination. There is quite a different feeling, on the part of the community at large, for those clergymen who thus seek the good of all, and for those whose energies are restricted within denominational limits, and whose hearts are interested only in the exclusive interests of their

Church. The cause of social progress itself, too, will be greatly benefited by the active assistance of earnest Christian men. There is, undoubtedly, a tendency to secularism on the part of social reformers. The idea is, that the laws of social economy, if but duly respected, are sufficient to secure the happiness and comfort of mankind. Many lean to the notion that religion is but another name for superstition, and that, instead of aiding, it is fitted to hinder the development of the laws of society. The presence of Christian men would at least show that, in their view, religion and social law may be worked, and ought to be worked, not as antagonists, but as allies. It would secure that each subject should at least be looked at from a religious point of view. For the right and satisfactory solution of social problems, it is essential that they be looked at from all points of view. Employers look at them naturally from their own stand-point. Laborers look at them from another. Political economists try to hold the balance right between the two. But it is necessary that they be looked at, too, from the stand-point of Christianity. Christian men lose the opportunity of doing great good when they show themselves cold or indifferent to such matters. Without their aid, there can not be the right composition of forces; the ball of social advancement can not be sent forward upon the true diagonal.

We have now to direct attention to the second class of cases, in which the consideration of the connection of the Christian Church with social improvement becomes a question of high practical interest. We mean the case of a barbarous community, which missionaries are striving to civilize and Christianize.

It is well known, in the history of modern missions, that Christian missionaries, in many cases, have directed their particular attention to the state of society, and have interested themselves, down often to the minutest details, in secular arrangements. The famous Elliot did wonders in the way of civilizing the wandering Indians of North America, gathering them into villages, and teaching them many of the useful arts. John Williams and Robert Moffat, and a host of others, have pursued a similar policy. Did they, in so doing, contravene any principles established by the example of the founders of Christianity, or does their mode of procedure run counter to the views which we have been endeavoring, in this paper, to support?

To judge fairly in this inquiry, we must bear in mind in what a different relation from that of the founders of Christianity the missionaries stood toward the highest civilization of their times. The Apostles came forth from a country of inferior civilization, to preach at Athens, Corinth, Rome, and Alexandria, where the most advanced civilization of the age prevailed. Having received no special message to deliver to men on the subject of social improvement, it would have been somewhat ridiculous for them to attempt to give lessons on a topic where their opportunities were in some respects inferior to those of their audience. But English missionaries have gone forth from the very head-quarters of modern civilization, to regions where the social thermometer has stood below zero. It may be noticed, by the way, as a singular testimony to Christianity, that wherever it is now established, civilization finds its most congenial home. Of the vast variety of products, from all quarters of the globe, that dazzled the eye in the great Exhibition of 1862, it was remarked as a singular fact, that none of importance came from any country where Christianity, in some form, was not the prevailing faith.

This fact gives to modern missionaries an immense advantage in dealing with barbarous people. It is the easiest thing in the world to establish in the minds of the people a belief in the superior power of the missionaries, by simply exhibiting to them a few of the results of our advanced civilization. In countries like the South Sea Islands, our missionaries have found, by experience, that this is the easiest and most effectual mode of securing a hold on the interest and the respect of the people. Another circumstance to be borne in mind is, that this interference, if it may be so called, with the temporal concerns of the people, has been acquiesced in very cordially by the people themselves. It has not been resented as an interference; it has been accepted as a boon. Yet, even at the very best, the missionaries will do well to regard it as but a temporary expedient, not to be habitually made use of beyond the first stage of their connection with the barbarous people. The sooner the missionaries can fall back on the apostolic rule the better: "We will give ourselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the Word."

In concluding this paper, we will merely state, in substance, the principal practical conclusions to which we have come.

In the first place, beyond all doubt, the Christian Church should direct special attention toward fostering the spirit out of which all true social improvement springs. The duty of looking not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others; of doing good to all men, as we have opportunity; of considering one another, to provoke unto love and to good works; of loving our neighbor as ourselves; of putting no stumbling-block in our brother's path; of impregnating the whole business of life with the Spirit of Christ, and trying to find, in all the occasions of common life opportunities for the exercise of the Christian graces, should never cease to be enforced. Apart from the direct good which, with God's blessing, would attend this course in the sphere of social activity, it is impossible to estimate the additional power and weight which it would yield to the more spiritual aims and efforts of the Church. Every enlightened Christian laments the loss of influence which many good men sustain from some inconsistency in this direction, from their hardness as masters, or their greed as merchants, or from their want of genial, chastened, affectionate temper. Religion would appear in a more winning light if associated with all the social graces; and Christianity itself would have more of the stamp of divinity on its very face, if it were seen contributing in so blessed a manner to heal all the evils that have come among us through sin.

Hence, secondly, we would have Churches, or rather preachers, in their public and pastoral work, to urge on the members of their flocks, who have much in their power, their obligation to do what they can for promoting the social prosperity of their neighborhoods. Employers of labor, whether in town or in the country, are in this category. Let them be Christian employers. Not, of course, after the fashion of a master known to us, who made a point, in paying the weekly wages, of giving every man a religious tract, but was notorious over the country side for paying poorer wages than any one else. First just and then generous, is the Christian order. The thing, of all others, most requisite is sympathy. Any thing that an employer may do for his work-people is of little value unless he feels rightly, and shows the right feeling toward them. Of course, we must not forget that the work-people have reciprocal duties, and that these, also, must be enforced. They must be faithful, considerate, con-

scientious, trustworthy. On this point the New Testament perpetually reminds us of the circle of Christian duty. And on this, as on every other subject, the Christian pulpit should be an echo of the Christian record.

Lastly, we would have the Church to encourage those of her ministers or members who feel a special interest in the subject to do all they can, in their individual capacity, consistently with their other duties, for advancing the temporal welfare of the community. An individual minister may do much that the collective body may not do. On his own responsibility, he may take a part in many undertakings on which the Church could not enter, upon her responsibility. The press will give him that aid in circulating his views which he might be tempted to seek from the publicity of Church courts. By this course he will not be committing others to his views, nor asking them to pledge themselves to positions which imperfect information may make them unwilling to take up. True, he does all this *cum periculo*. He runs the risk of becoming secularized. His likelihood to avoid this risk depends on the strength of the spiritual fire within him. If the spirit of earnest piety be strong, there is little to fear. If it be weak, the danger is, that he will enter on secularities in a *con amore* spirit, very different from that in which he preaches the Gospel. In that case he will hurt the cause which he seeks to advance; and the dust of worldliness will soil his garments, and dim the luster of his soul.

W. G. B.

NEWPORT-PAGNEL AND ITS ASSOCIATIONS.*

The ministry of the Independent Church of Newport-Pagnel has been for three generations in the same family. This is a most unusual thing in any denomination; especially so is it in that of the Congregationalists, and we can not wonder that the centenary of the ordination of the Rev. William Bull, the grandfather of the present pastor, should have excited considerable interest. In connection with the celebration of this festival, the Rev. Josiah Bull was led to examine minutely into the early history of the Church, and more particularly into the personal experiences of his immediate predecessors; and to this we owe the appearance of one of the most interesting and profitable biographies which, in recent days, has come under our notice. It is not often that a man's life will bear to be written half a century after his death; but in this instance the memoir has improved by the keeping, and will be read not only for the sake of him who is its subject, but, also, and perhaps even more eagerly, because of the side-lights which it throws upon the remarkable men with whom he lived in terms of closest intimacy. In the limited space at our disposal, we can not hope to do full justice to the work; the most we shall seek will be to give our readers a specimen of the good things which it contains, combining therewith, if possible, an epitome of the life-work which it so ably chronicles.

Born on the 22d of December, 1738, in the little village of Irthlingborough, Northamptonshire, William Bull was brought up mainly by his grandfather, who is described as a man of the good old Puritan mold, keeping the Sabbath with great strictness and decorum, and taking his grandson with him regularly to the house of prayer. Sometimes, however, it would appear that he had a little difficulty in restraining the native humor of the boy; and we are told that on one occasion, when the preacher, in discoursing on the words, "Write blessed are the dead, that die in the Lord," gave out the following very original division: "We shall consider

* From the *United Presbyterian Magazine*, February, 1865. *Memorials of the Rev. William Bull, of Newport-Pagnel*, 1738—1814. By his grandson, the Rev. Josiah Bull. London: Nisbet & Co. 1864.

who are *right* blessed and who are *wrong* blessed," young Bull was so tickled that he burst out into a loud laugh, and was forthwith ordered by the preacher to be turned out of church for his irreverence. The culprit in this instance, to our thinking, was the minister, and not the child; for if he had not been trained to habits of very close attention, he would not have observed the ridiculous character of the division; and the fact is interesting as showing how early the faculty of observation was developed in him. When he was only twelve or fourteen years of age, he was taken to Weston-Flavel, to hear Mr. Hervey; and long after he could tell how, though it was only an ordinary service, the church was crowded to excess, how the preacher was in the last stage of consumption, and how when he stretched out his pale, thin hand, it seemed almost transparent. On his return from this service, he repeated the entire sermon he had heard; and, even late in life, one very remarkable passage remained upon his memory. It was to the following effect: "You have observed the walls on either side the path leading to this church. They are covered, as you know, with ivy. And you may pluck off the leaves, and break off the branches, so that none of them shall be seen on the outside; but the roots of the plant have so worked themselves into the wall, that it would be impossible entirely to eradicate them without taking down the wall, and not leaving one stone upon another; and so must this frail body be taken down, and then, and not till then, shall we get rid of the remains of a degenerate nature." Very early our young friend manifested a desire for knowledge, and, by indomitable perseverance, he taught himself the Hebrew language, without tutor, or grammar, or lexicon. He found the letters heading the different parts of the 119th Psalm in an old English Bible. He saw that the Hebrew read backward, and he knew the first word in the Bible must be "In," or "In the beginning." He looked in his concordance for other places where the word "beginning" occurred, and, finding the same letters, he wrote down the word; and thus he proceeded, word by word, till he had formed for himself a rude lexicon, and then a grammar, and, at length, he was able to read the Old Testament in the original tolerably well—a feat, this, worthy of being recorded beside the story of John Brown, of Haddington, and his Greek Testament. It was Bull's desire to give himself to the work of the ministry; but not until his removal to Bedford was the way opened up for

the attainment of his wish. In that town, he joined the church, under the ministry of the Rev. Samuel Sanderson, and very soon, under his instructions, he commenced systematic study. He mastered Ruddiman's Rudiments, we are told, in a fortnight; and, after learning Greek, he was, in the year 1759, admitted into the Dissenting Academy at Daventry. Of this institution Ashworth, the successor of Doddridge, was then the principal. Priestly had just left it, and the influence of his companionship was evinced by the fact that some of the students had a leaning to Arianism and Socinianism. Bull, however, was at this time, as throughout his life, a decided Calvinist; but this difference in sentiment did not prevent him from being the friend and favorite of all alike. Like other students, he and his companions were fond of a frolic, and one amusing tale is told by his biographer. Disliking the beer with which, it seems, they were supplied, they voted it not only small, but dead, and decided that it should be buried. Accordingly, a large can of the liquor was obtained, a procession formed, and, when the beer was poured upon the ground, a funeral oration was pronounced by William Bull, who was arrayed in a surplice, manufactured out of sheets of white paper! What Dr. Ashworth said to all this is not recorded; but if he discovered it, no doubt the culprits would be solemnly rebuked, for he was a stern disciplinarian, as is proved by the fact that the very night before his leaving the institution, Bull, who had been to hear George Whitfield, and had staid beyond the appointed hour, was locked out, and was admitted by the library window solely through the favor of the classical tutor.

From the Daventry institution, Mr. Bull passed, in the year 1764, to the pastorate of the church of Newport-Pagnel. The early history of this congregation goes back to the era of the Nonconformist Ejection, and many interesting incidents connected with it are given in one of the chapters of this fascinating book; but we can not enter here upon them: our interest centers upon more modern men, for, during the fifty years of his ministry in this quiet retreat, Mr. Bull came into contact with individuals, some of whose names will live while the English language lasts. The first of these remarkable men who is mentioned by the biographer is the elder Ryland, whose excellencies and eccentricities were so strangely interblended, and regarding whom we have here preserved for us the following criticism by Robert Hall,

which, for the sake of both men, we gladly transfer to our pages:

"The Rev. Robert Hall and Mr. Foster—of Biggleswade—were conversing together, and, the name of Mr. Ryland being brought up, Mr. Hall referred to a sermon he had once heard him preach. It was at an association of ministers, I think, in Northamptonshire, and it must have been when Mr. Hall was a very young man, yet the impression of it seems to have been most vivid. The text was in Mark xiv, 33: 'And he began to be sore amazed.' The first head was, 'Christ was sore amazed at the extent of human depravity.' 'It was,' said Mr. Hall, 'as if, in the illustration of this point, Mr. Ryland had condensed into a brief half-hour's statement the reading of a lifetime. You felt that he had expended his whole power upon this one topic, and that it was impossible to rise higher. Under his second division, "Christ was sore amazed at the weight of the divine wrath," his exposition was still more striking, and the impression was, "This surely can not be surpassed." But the handling of the last particular—I think it had reference to the malignity of Satan—was the climax of all. It was the most wonderful discourse,' said Hall, 'I ever heard. It was, sir, as if a man had brought the cattle on a thousand hills, and all the incense of Arabia to a single sacrifice.'"

Some time after his settlement at Newport, Mr. Bull made the acquaintance of the well-known John Newton, who was then Vicar of Olney, a village a few miles distant. The acquaintance grew into an intimacy, and that, again, ripened into a Christian friendship, which lasted through life, and has, we doubt not, been long since renewed in the world of glory. The warm Christian heart of Newton could not be confined within any ecclesiastical limits; and in these days of Church of England exclusivism, from which not even Evangelicals can be held guiltless, it is refreshing to read of the manner in which Churchman and Dissenter, in this instance, went hand in hand. Frequently Newton was found worshiping in a Nonconformist meeting-house. He was habitually present at the gatherings of the Baptist Association in Olney, and at ordination services; and, on the former occasions, the ministers often shared the hospitality of the vicarage. Bull and he were constantly communicating with each other in reference to texts, sermons, and

schemes; they borrowed each other's books; dined and smoked together, and held each other in the highest esteem. Very precious, too, was their spiritual communion; and, in the correspondence maintained between them, we are continually coming on passages of the richest beauty, the most genuine pathos, and the deepest Christian experience. Here is a specimen: "Lend me," says Newton, "'The Way to Christ.' [By Jacob Behmen.] I am willing to be a debtor to the wise and to the unwise, to doctors and shoemakers, if I can get a hint or a *nota bene* from any one, without respect to parties. When a house is on fire, Churchmen and Dissenters, Methodists, Papists, Moravians, and Mystics, are all welcome to bring water. At such times nobody asks, 'Pray, friend, whom do you hear? or what do you think of the five points?'" Again, giving his opinion of Mr. Bull, he says: "Conversation, with most Christians, is something like going to court, where, except you are dressed exactly according to a prescribed standard, you will either not be admitted, or must expect to be heartily stared at, but you and I can meet and converse *sans contrainte* in an undress, without fear of offending, or being counted offenders for a word out of place, and not exactly in the pink of the mode. . . . I know not how it is. I think my sentiments and experience are as orthodox and Calvinistic as need be, and yet I am a sort of *speckled bird* among my Calvinistic brethren." This last expression gives occasion to Mr. Bull to say, in his reply: "You know, Brother, that those of our fraternity which are called birds of passage, before their flight, hold a kind of national assembly for several weeks, to consult about the coast to which they shall direct their flight, to try their pinions, and to adjust their plumage. Exactly for the same reason I long to see you; for I think we are not only speckled birds, but birds of passage, too, and I long to hear and speak about that glorious shore to which we are bound." Then, in a letter of Newton's asking Mr. Bull to dinner, there occurs the following most beautiful passage: "When you are with the King, and getting good for yourself, speak a word for me and mine. I have reason to think you see him oftener, and have nearer access to him than myself. Indeed, I am unworthy to look at him, or speak to him at all, much more that he should speak tenderly to me. Yet I am not wholly without his notice. He supplies all my wants, and

I live under his protection. My enemies see his royal arms over my door, and dare not enter. Were I detached from him for a moment, in that moment they would make an end of me."

Repeatedly the two friends were fellow-laborers in good works. Thus, in his diary, Newton writes: "Mr. Bull spoke excellently on the words, 'Thou wilt have compassion,' at the Great House. It was the first time of his appearance there, but I hope it will not be the last." This "Great House" was an old mansion at Olney, in which the Vicar rented a room, where meetings were held for prayer and the exposition of the Scriptures. There is still in existence a record of the persons who engaged in prayer at these gatherings, and it is interesting to know that the name of William Cowper frequently occurs up to the time when his distressing mental malady returned upon him. One who was often present at such times has said: "Of all the men I ever heard pray, no one equaled Mr. Cowper." But this very close fellowship between Newton and Bull was considerably interrupted by the removal of the former to London, where, in his own quaint way of describing it, "he formed a connection for life with one Mary Woolnoth, a reputed London saint, in Lombard Street." Still, however, they regularly corresponded, and frequently saw each other, till death came to separate them for a season, and they never lost their affection for one another. Toward the close of the career of both, and when Newton was entering his seventy-sixth year, we find him writing thus to his "dear Bull:" "Though the flame of our affection is not much supported by the fruit of frequent letters and converse, I trust it still burns brightly, for it is fed from a secret, invisible, and inexhaustible source. If two needles are properly touched by a magnet, they will retain their sympathy for a long time; but if two hearts are properly united to the heavenly magnet, their mutual attraction will be permanent in time and to eternity. Blessed be the Lord for a good hope that it is thus between you and me. I could not love you better if I saw you or heard from you every day." The last letter Newton wrote to Mr. Bull was in condolence with him on the death of his wife, and was written when the sailor-preacher was almost in his dotage; but, to the close, these two men, like Jonathan and David, were knit together, and the correspondence between

them, so fully given in these pages, is one of the greatest charms of the book.

When Newton left Olney for London, he particularly requested Mr. Bull to call on Cowper, rightly arguing that the companionship of such a man would be of great service to the poet. This commission the Newport minister took an early opportunity of fulfilling, and almost at once the heart of Cowper was captivated by his conversation. Very soon he became an intimate friend of the poet, and, in the book before us, we have given to us a few of these letters of his, full of what Coleridge calls his "divine chit-chat," and interesting to all who love the memory of the author of "The Task." We pass over his well-known description of Mr. Bull, in a letter to Mr. Unwin, and give a few extracts, which, from their connection with the poetry and personal experience of Cowper, will, we doubt not, prove acceptable to our readers.

Speaking of his writing, which Mr. Bull has praised, the poet says: "I write in hopes of pleasing you, and such as you, and although I must confess that, at the same time, I cast a sidelong glance at the good-liking of the world at large, I believe I can say it was more for the sake of their advantage and instruction than their praises. They are children; if we give them physic, we must sweeten the rim of the cup with honey. If my book is so far honored as to be made the vehicle of true knowledge to any that are ignorant, I shall rejoice; and do already rejoice that it has procured me a proof of your esteem, whom I had rather please than all the writers of both reviews." Again, referring to some lines which he had destroyed, he says: "I am a severer critic upon myself than you could imagine, and have the singular knack of being out of humor with every thing, or almost every thing, I write, when it is about nine days old." After Mr. Bull learned this fact, he requested Cowper to send him his pieces so soon as they were written, so that they might be out of harm's way; and to this we owe the preservation of the poem beginning, "The rose had been wash'd, just wash'd in a shower," and the "Ode to Peace," commencing, "No longer I follow a sound." In another letter, the poet thus alludes to the first book of The Task: "The 'Sofa' is ended, but not finished—a paradox which your natural acumen, sharpened by habits of logical attention, will enable you to reconcile in a moment. Do not imagine, however, that I

lounge over it; on the contrary, I find it severe exercise to mold and fashion it to my mind." To Mr. Bull's suggestion, also, we owe those very exquisite translations from Madame Guyon, with which Cowper has enriched his pages. In a letter to Unwin, he says: "I have translated several of them (that is, Madame Guyon's poems), and shall proceed till I have filled a Liliputian paper-book I happen to have by me, and, when filled, I shall present it to Mr. Bull. He is her passionate admirer—rode twenty miles to see her picture in the house of a stranger, which stranger politely insisted on his acceptance of it, and it now hangs over his parlor chimney. It is a striking portrait, too characteristic not to be a strong resemblance; and, were it encompassed with a glory instead of a nun's hood, might pass for the face of an angel." But more deeply touching than such references to his literary productions, are one or two of his letters, in which he speaks of his spiritual gloom. How sad are the following sentences: "Both your advice and your manner of giving it are gentle and friendly, and like yourself. I thank you for them, and do not refuse your counsel because it is not good, or because I dislike it, but because it is not for me. There is not a man upon earth that might not be the better for it, myself only excepted. Prove to me that I have a right to pray, and I will pray without ceasing—yea, and praise, too, even in the belly of this hell, compared with which, Jonah's was a palace, a temple of the living God. But, let me add, there is no encouragement in the Scriptures so comprehensive as to include my case, nor any consolation so effectual as to reach it. I do not relate it to you, because you could not believe it: you would agree with me if you could. And yet the sin by which I am excluded from the privileges I once enjoyed you would account no sin. You would even tell me it was a duty." What a sorrowful mental hallucination have we here! How touching, too, is the allusion to the same thing, in these words: "I only regret that I did not know you intimately in those happier days, when the frame of my heart and mind was such as might have made a connection with me not altogether unworthy of you." Occasionally he seems to rise somewhat above his gloom, and almost, again, his hope, as in the following passage: "I would I were a Hottentot, or even a Dissenter, so that my views of a hereafter were more comfortable. But such as I am, Hope, if it please God, may visit even

me; and, should we ever meet again, possibly we may part no more. Then, if Presbyterians ever find the way to heaven, you and I may know each other in that better world, and rejoice in the recital of the terrible things we endured in this. . . . . When that day comes, you shall acknowledge my story a more wonderful one than yours."

But we dare not trespass longer upon the patience of our readers. We have left ourselves no space to speak of the training academy for ministers, which was founded at Newport, under Mr. Bull's superintendence; nor can we say any thing of his connection with Mr. Thornton, that princely philanthropist,

> "Who had an industry in doing good,
> Restless as his who toils and sweats for food;"

and whose son Henry has been so minutely portrayed by Sir James Stephen, in his famous article on "The Clapham Sect." This gentleman looked upon Mr. Bull almost as his private chaplain, taking him with him in various tours—to the Land's End, to Ireland, and to Scotland—and, besides supplying him with books for the preparation of a commentary on the Psalms, he generously took upon himself the entire support of the institution just mentioned, and made provision for its maintenance so long as Mr. Bull lived. Neither can we follow the biographer through the long series of his grandfather's preaching engagements in London, though we are sorely tempted to give some racy and extremely characteristic letters of Rowland Hill originating therein. For all these, however, we must refer our readers to the work itself. In the latter years of his ministry, Mr. Bull had his only son associated with him in the pastorate; and in the year 1814 he finished his course with joy, resting on the Rock of Ages. His life was at once an earnest and useful one, and his memoir helps us to understand something of the position of the Nonconformity in England during the second half of the eighteenth century. He was an excellent preacher; his sermons being at once original, fervid, and impressive. Frequently there were dashes of eccentricity in them—Bullisms, as he himself called them; but invariably the cross was in the center, and the main burden of his discourses was "the ministry of reconciliation." His own advice to his son may, perhaps, best describe himself: "The more retirement you have before you preach, the better in

general will you preach. I like to read, before I preach, some good book, and the more spiritual it is the better. Then I like to preach my sermon over to myself for at least two hours. When I do this I am sure to feel liberty. In all your praying and preaching, never lose sight of the divine unction. Be as spiritual as you can, and as orthodox as may be. Remember we are not heathen philosophers, nor philosophical moralists, but ministers of Christ, and are called to preach nothing but what is peculiar to the Gospel of Christ, either its doctrines, or its precepts, or its promises. The Gospel—the peculiarities of the Gospel—is the great theme of the faithful servant of Christ and friend to the souls of men." With these weighty words, as seasonable now as when they were written, we lay down the memoir of this excellent man, commending it to the attention of our readers, and assuring them that they will find it almost like a continuation of the "Cardiphonia." Less intellectual than many of our modern biographies, it is more deeply spiritual than most of them; and the ministry of to-day may learn much in this department from the Vicar of Olney and his friend at Newport-Pagnel.

In order to the acceptable worship of the LIVING GOD, there must be a large measure of personal and domestic preparation—a reflection which at once condemns many prevailing customs of the age. In the higher circles of society, Saturday night is generally chosen for the time of the most select assemblies; in the middle and lower ranks, it is, with some noble exceptions, the chief time of hard trading and hard work. Vast are the numbers of persons who on that night go jaded and late to rest, and who find themselves accordingly half asleep with weariness during the whole of Sunday. So complicated are the relations of English business that it is difficult to lay down any absolute rule of action; so that we must content ourselves with uttering formative ideas nobler than the prevailing usages, and with expressing the hope that some day the "necessities of trade" will not forbid the observation of Saturday evening in the Church as the "preparation of the Sabbath." When once Churches have learned thus to prepare themselves for God's service, they will find that God will reveal himself in the public assemblies as he seldom does now.—*Evangelical Christendom.*

POPULAR INFIDELITY IN THE METROPOLIS.*

"We are entering on a new era in theology. The carping and false criticism of the last age, with its sensual wit and political selfishness, were not always wisely, even if for the time successfully, dealt with by the defenders of the faith. Another generation, however, has arisen; and the real and sincere dealing with all questions of moral and religious import, can not (let us hope) be arrested. Objections, difficulties, theories, and counter-theories seem destined to find their honest level. Facts will be ascertained, and thoughts will work their penetrating way; and let us trust that there will be no turning back. For the Catholic faith and its true interpretation we have no fear."

The opinion expressed in this quotation, from the *Literary Churchman*, is probably a very prevalent one, and to some extent, but only to some extent, it is correct. In the upper strata, as we may call them, of doubt and unbelief, there is certainly every appearance of a disposition to conduct controversy on purer and more honorable principles. But in the lower strata of doubt and unbelief these hopeful signs are by no means always visible; on the contrary, coarse and vulgar invective, carping and false criticism, sensual wit, and political selfishness are lamentably common. The writings and the language of Thomas Paine are still current among the uneducated advocates of skepticism and infidelity. The sheer dishonesty and angry prejudice of the Rev. Robert Taylor still pervert the minds of many, and his *Diegesis* and *Syntagma* furnish the student of bitter incredulity with text-books. Mr. G. J. Holyoake claims to be exceptionally polite among modern living "Secularists;" but his fellow-worker, if not his colleague, Mr. Bradlaugh, *alias* "Iconoclast,"† rejoices in the crushing weight of his invectives, and the overwhelming torrents of sarcasm and denunciation, which he launches against religion. As are the apostles, so are the disciples. Here and there one calmly, quietly, and even courteously, propounds his principles; but there are more who

---

* Abridged from the *Journal of Sacred Literature*, Jan., 1865.

† *Aliases* among infidels or secularists are very common.

have no such self-control, and who ignorantly and furiously rave against all Christians and all Christianity, and often against the very being of a God, and what used to be regarded as the elements of natural religion. We have reason to believe that like differences appear in the lives of these men. Some allow of no law of moral conduct beyond that of expediency. Others claim the possession of an inward faculty—whether reason or a moral sense—by means of which they discern right from wrong, and are directed to choose the good and to avoid the evil. Others, again, simply and broadly build on the foundation of gross materialism, and affirm that every man is what he is, and does what he does, as a mere result of organization; hence, virtue merits no praise, and vice no blame, except in so far as this, that somehow or other, in early life at least, a man's tendencies resulting from organization may be modified by education. This materialism is extensively prevalent in the metropolis to which our observations apply, and shows itself in the most grotesque and vulgar, nay, monstrous forms. Under its influence, one man becomes a philanthrophist, and another an atheist; one and all deny the existence of spirit and of mind as distinct from matter. It is not possible that the low materialist should believe himself endowed with a soul, and destined to immortality. Thus, God and the soul, death, resurrection, judgment, heaven, hell, sin, holiness, nature, and a thousand other great realities and truths, are either summarily dismissed, or utterly transformed, by some eccentric explanation.

The secondary causes of the unbelief which is so common among the working classes are, of course, the same essentially as in other grades of society, but with some differences. Ignorance of the true teaching of Scripture, and of the nature of language and of evidence, as well as ignorance of many other things that are important, is one of the most prominent reasons for this hostility to the Bible, to Churches, to Christians, to every thing with which the idea of religion is connected.

Another cause, or a branch of this, is illustrated by Pope's well-known line, "A little knowledge is a dangerous thing." Certain men have got a little knowledge of scientific objections, of critical difficulties, of various readings, of Bishop Colenso and Sir C. Lyell, of Strauss and Renan, of Darwin, and a host of other matters. They have learned quite enough to excite or to

confirm their suspicions, but they are utterly without the means of investigating properly the truth of what they suspect. They are able to frame objections, and there is something extraordinary in the facility with which they will throw out a whole string of these objections. It is lamentable to think that while they can do this, and can feel all the force of the objections, they do not know enough frequently to appreciate a reply.

Blank ignorance and partial knowledge present enormous difficulties, which few can realize who have not attempted their removal. However incredible it may seem, we have known a railing rejector of all religion object to it on the ground of its absurdity. The case adduced by him in proof arose out of our Savior's declaration, in John iii, to Nicodemus: "The parsons tell us," said this unhappy man, "that we must be born again. I should like to know how that can be. I was born once, and I don't see how I can be born again," etc. Not satisfied with this, the same individual denounced the doctrine of a resurrection and a future life, declaring that he did not believe that once dead he should live again, unless it was by becoming the food of loathsome creatures.

The case just quoted may be deemed an exception. Alas! it could be easily paralleled by examples of equal brutishness. But suppose it represents the lowest level, ought we not to know what that is, though it shows us men who have little that is human except the form? When gross ignorance and impenetrable stupidity are combined, it is all but impossible for any human teaching to prevail, except by very slow and almost imperceptible degrees. When, however, deep-rooted prejudice and immoral principles characterize the ignorant and stupid man, the case is almost hopeless. Yet even this is not uncommon. As regards prejudice, it is something wonderful in its depth and intensity. There is no possibility of hope that the slave of prejudice will be reached by rational argument: sarcasm and invective, wisely and cautiously employed, may touch him, and, as a rule, will do so more than any representations of divine love, or declarations of a personal desire for the good of the wretched individual. How to expel this demon of prejudice is a serious problem, and a hopeless one, unless we know its causes as well as its results.

The prejudiced infidel is often furious in his denunciations of

the Bible and of Christianity. Hence, it is not uncommon to find a man laboring to prove the Bible "that abominable book," and to show that Christians must necessarily also be abominable in proportion as they carry it out. Your clever, witty, rhetorical atheist can wind up an harangue by declaring of Holy Scripture that "it is all evil and no good, all false and none true." This reckless lying, this monstrous and impudent assertion of what is not true, and known to be not true, is a chronic disease of infidelity. An experience of several months among them, and every opportunity of hearing all they could possibly say against religion, has left upon the writer's mind a conviction of infidel dishonesty which time will never remove, and which is fully justified by concessions made by men of their own party. This deliberate refusal to see the truth and to say the truth, on the part of avowed truth-seekers, is intimately connected with prejudice. Sometimes it is the natural result of avowed immoral principles. Without going over the catalogue of vices, let us give one illustration. Observe, all these men are the champions of TRUTH. Many know that among recent controversies in the upper regions of literature, there has been one upon the subject of lying and deceit. Certain Protestants have accused certain Roman Catholics of teaching at least equivocation, and in theory violating the sanctity of truth.

There ought to have been no controversy upon the subject, perhaps, because the question was disposed of, in the abstract, as long since as Pascal's time. Dr. Newman might have said, "I do not allow that a man may practice equivocation and deceit, because, although St. Liguori has said this may be done *ex justa causa*, I don't believe a *justa causa* can possibly arise." However, he has written a very remarkable book, and one that would have got him a place in the cells of the Inquisition if he had written it under certain other circumstances. As it is, we expect to hear the volume gets a niche *inter libros prohibitos*. Well, this question of the sanctity of truth has several times come up in our hearing, and on two occasions, certainly, it was laid down that a man was justified in lying if he found it expedient. This is what we call an immoral principle, and in each instance it was only discovered by detecting the speaker in a falsehood, and by at once questioning him as to his views on the general question. On a third occasion the principle was illus-

trated in this way: the speaker declared that a disputant need acknowledge the truth of nothing which destroyed his arguments, and that his supreme aim should be to gain the victory in debate; that to effect this he ought to ignore whatever favored that which he opposed, and to put, in the strongest form, all that could be devised against it. We have already mentioned Robert Taylor as practicing deception and misrepresentation, and we have found similar conduct so common as to authorize us in tracing it to an immoral principle extensively recognized among low-class infidels.

A very frequent case connected with this point is that dogged perverseness which refuses to put a candid construction upon any thing, and which turns every thing to the account of unbelief. This, also, we shall illustrate by a recent example. It is well known that Dean Alford has written a paper in Dr. Guthrie's *Sunday Magazine*, in which he speaks of the erroneous readings and renderings of the Authorized Version of the Bible. This article fell into the hands of one of our unbelieving acquaintances, and was found to contain an unlimited supply of concessions favorable to infidelity. Next Sunday our objector makes his appearance in the chosen arena for the out-door mission of infidelity. He taxes Christians with hypocrisy and fraud, and declares, on the authority of Dean Alford, that what goes into the hands of women and children as God's Word is merely a human invention. We had not then read the Dean's article; but, knowing the facts of the case, and knowing, too, that he was too honest and too wise a man to say what was so vague and absurd, we confidently denounced the statement as a gross perversion, and insisted upon the production of what Dr. Alford had said. In this we succeeded, and the magazine, crumpled, soiled, and pencil-marked, issued at last from a pocket where it had kept company with far different characters. Now, said we, you will please to read what the Dean has said. This he, however, would not do; but eventually allowed it to be read. The passage was this: "A formidable list of passages might be given, in which our version either has confessedly misrendered the original, or has followed a form of the text now well known not to have been the original form. These might be corrected at any time, and it is a grievous thing that this has not been done, and it is not now doing. For, as matters now stand,

we are printing for reading in our Churches—we are sending forth, into the cottage and the mansion, books containing passages and phrases which pretend to be the Word of God and are not; and that, when the remedy is easy, and lies at any time in our power." These words are true, if somewhat unguarded, and we honor him who could be so courageous as to speak them. But we may add that the propagation of this knowledge will compel the Churches, in self-defense, to labor for the production of a better version from a purer text. But to continue our narration. We were asked what honesty there could be in the translators who mixed up with God's Word what was man's word. We replied they were honest, and gave the best translations in their power; but since the year 1611 several important events have occurred. 1. Some words and phrases have either changed their meaning, or lost it by going out of use. For example, "to take thought," in the text, "Take no thought for the morrow;" again, "sincere," in the passage, "Desire the sincere milk of the word." Now, "to take thought" was "to be anxious" or "filled with care," and "sincere" meant "pure" or "unadulterated." For these changes the translators can not be blamed, because the nation itself has made them since. 2. A considerable number of very ancient manuscripts of the Greek New Testament have been discovered, and compared with one another since our version was made; and modern critics, by comparing these, have inferred that the text of our translation is not so perfect as it might now be made. Here we called attention to some of the objectionable readings which we had marked in a Greek Testament then in our pocket. We proceeded: 3. Modern scholarship is much in advance of that of the period at which our translators labored. The scientific study of languages has helped us to see more clearly the meaning of particular portions of ancient documents. The investigation of the topography, the botany, the natural history of Bible countries has, also, enabled us to correct a number of circumstantial errors. There may be still other reasons to account for what Dean Alford so frankly calls attention to, and no honest man of sense can get mischief out of his words.

The only reply to all this was, that "the Holy Ghost ought to have kept the translators from error, and that the clergy found it to their interest to keep the people in ignorance." We call

this perverseness—an obstinate refusal or inability to put the right construction upon facts and language.

One of the most prevalent objections to religion seems to be traceable to the errors and inconsistencies of Christians. The divisions of sects and the strife of parties supply an inexhaustible theme. Which *religion* are they to follow—that of the Roman Catholic, of the Greek, of the Churchman, of the Presbyterian, of the Independent, of the Baptist, of the Methodist, etc., etc.? Sometimes the list will take in Buddhism, Hindooism, Mohammedanism, and so forth. The conclusion is, that because all can not be every way right, none are right. It is not seen that Deism, Pantheism, or Atheism are additional systems of opinion upon religion, and that he who is consistent should reject them, too, because they differ from one another, and from the rest. But the truth is, that much of this denunciation of sects and religions is pretense, and what is vulgarly called humbug—a mere excuse for impiety. With reference to the faults of the Church, we admit their grievousness, and can not but wail over them before God and men. It is a horrible thing that avowed members of the Church should so live and act as to make the Church the laughing-stock of the infidel. It is a terrible thing that, within the same Church, the scornful finger of infidelity can point to Brother Ignatius, to Bishop Colenso, and to the Dean of Ripon, and ask which holds the doctrine of the Church, or has the Church no doctrine at all? The happy family principle, after all, when pushed to this excess, only excites the scorn and contempt of the mocking blasphemer. Along with these things we hear of pluralities, non-residence, nepotism, simony, fox-hunting parsons, and whatever else is mean or questionable among the clergy. Tithes and church-rates, and all compulsion in religious matters form an endless fund of ridicule and reproach. The evil lives, the grasping avarice, the tricks of trade, the political selfishness, the occasional immorality of professed Christians, are hurled as so much mire against Christianity, and declared to be good reasons for rejecting it. Can Christians treat all this with indifference? Let the Churches beware lest the blood of souls be upon them.

Some other real or alleged causes of skepticism and infidelity may be found in the ensuing description of a few scenes which have been witnessed in the metropolis during 1864. We may as

well say, that the place referred to is in the north-east of London, and that the transaction referred to occurred before midsummer last. The debates were first observed by us in May, and they continued, without intermission, on Sundays, down to the end of October. From 11 A. M. until 10 P. M., during most of that time, these discussions were maintained. The writer of this paper was anxious to know what infidelity and doubt among the working classes had to say, and how it would listen to information and reason. He, therefore, determined to throw aside every personal consideration, and try what he could do. He had formerly done the same thing elsewhere, and his success then induced him to try again. The effort was made, and one result has been an initiation into all that these deluded and misguided men have to say upon religion; a second result has been the actual communication of many items of knowledge to which those who assembled were and would have remained strangers. As for direct personal results, if there has been no striking "conversion" to record, there has been a general moderating of the wrath of the enemies, and much more that need not be here recorded. The general result is, that the truth has nothing to fear from publicity; but every thing to fear from being kept back. On the whole, the writer feels that he has not sacrificed his comfort in vain, and has much cause to be thankful for the help which God has given him, and in the impressions which have been produced on many minds.

There is assuredly a necessity for a return to the practice and tactics of earlier times. Infidelity, in the name of science, philosophy, truth-seeking, secularism, free-thinking, or what not, is rampant in our metropolis among the industrial classes, and men, women, and children are drinking in the poison, in full draughts of obscene blasphemy, or in the more diluted form of simple rationalism.

Infidelity, in every degree, openly and unblushingly takes the Christian's day of rest, and the Christian Bible, and uses them for mockery, ribaldry, blasphemy, and all evil. Will the Churches allow this to continue? Will they circulate either no books on Christian evidences, or only such as belong to an utterly different state of things? Will they allow the wolf to come and steal away their flocks for whom Christ died, and to steal them not by ones and twos, but by thousands? Will they

not go out into the wilderness, and into the highways and hedges, like the Master? Is routine and custom to be followed eternally and at all risks, or will the Church turn out of its rut and follow those who will not follow it? Is the Church to abide in almost universal ignorance of the actual forms and reasons, language and results, of a wide-spread infidelity which is appalling? Will no good Samaritan come and help those whom sin and Satan have robbed of their faith and wounded in their souls?

Books will do something, but they can not be written fitly until our best and wisest men will come down and learn from their own lips what these unhappy souls think, and feel, and speak. If this is not done, society will be revenged: there is a "Nemesis of Faith." But how converse with such men? First of all, you must endeavor to talk as they talk when they talk their best; you must use all your learning and wisdom, and make it so plain, and put it as forcible as possible, nor need you fear a certain use of irony and sarcasm; but this must be with caution. Deny nothing that is true, and state every question honestly and candidly. Treat every man with all kindness, courtesy, and respect; but be quite sure, unless you have something real, and solid, and earnest to give, you will have no chance of success. You must be tolerably familiar with the history of infidelity as well as of Christianity; you must especially be acquainted with the general history of controversy upon Christian evidences, from the Apostolic Father down to such discussions as those about *Essays and Reviews*, Renan, Strauss, and Bishop Colenso, all of whom are regarded as favoring infidelity in important particulars. You must be able to sustain any doctrinal statement by Scripture texts fairly interpreted. It will be ruinous for you to neglect acquaintance with various schools of philosophy, the principles of logic, and general science. But, above all, your Bible must be, like George Herbert's pulpit, "your joy and your throne." If you know Hebrew, and Greek, and Latin, you will find them useful. You must familiarize yourself with various readings and disputed translations, and most of the topics illustrated by a good Scripture Introduction, and a good edition of the Greek Testament. Familiarity with figurative, typical, and emblematical terms; with prophecies and their fulfillment; with miracles and the discussions upon them; with the literary history of the canon and of separate books; with supposed contradictions,

inconsistencies, immoral, cruel, and unjust maxims, etc., will all be in constant requisition. Great and frequent use may be made of an acquaintance with other religions—Buddhism, and Paganism, and Islam. You may be decided for your own Church, but you must be tolerant and gentle toward others. But no zeal nor charity in regard to Church principles will avail if you are not boldly and in all things one who loves, believes, and honors Christ—who accepts the Bible as the supreme rule of faith and law of life, and earnestly desires the present and eternal welfare of men.

In drawing these observations to a close, a few things must be said. These remarks are not intended as a full statement in any department touched upon; they are intended rather to suggest to those whose duties and other circumstances prevent them from knowing what transpires out of doors on Sundays that something must he done to stay the evil of which we speak. We do not advocate suppression; this would only lash them to fury—and let those who go to bind the monster beware of his tail. Suppression will not do; there is a more excellent way—the way of charity. Although the men who have been imprisoned for religious opinions during the last half century can be counted on one's fingers, these men can count them, and fling them into the teeth of those who preach a religion of love. What we think would do good, with the blessings of God's Holy Spirit, may be gathered from what precedes. Return to primitive practice we say; let Paul and Barnabas go to Mars' Hill, the school of Tyrannus, the market-place, and let them speak, and preach, and dispute as they did eighteen centuries ago; they will find Jews and Greeks enough to reason with; let our Apologists, our Quadratus, and Aristides, Melito and Justin, Tatian and Athenagoras, even our Origen, our Tertullian, and our Lactantius, come out of their cells, and oppose infidelity—not that of moldering books and of dead men, but that of the living Phygellus and Hermogenes, Celsus and Porphyry.